

# A Straight Talk to Old Brethren...



J. H. Morrison

# A Straight Talk

---

## To Old Brethren

---

With a Few Observations on Bible Organization

I commend it to all concerned, not for its eloquence, its rhetoric nor its smooth and well-rounded periods, but for the facts it contains, bluntly and simply told. . . . .

J. H. MORRISON



1916.

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry."--I Sam. 15:23.



## A Prefatory Word

---

This has been written in a piecemeal sort of way. First, it was written for my own convenience; second, I decided to enlarge upon it and put it in typewriting for some of my local friends here in the village; third, when I decided to put it into this form in order to still further develop my thought, it was necessary (to put it into the best form) to rewrite it. But I could not think of re-writing all these words again with my inexperienced left hand, for it grew very weary in the first writing; so, instead of going all over it and classifying my thoughts and putting them into a more condensed form, I concluded to let my typewritten article stand as it was and write out a little more fully my thoughts on the same subject reviewing them from a different standpoint, referring to some of the same quotations and scriptures again, with additional ones. This accounts for some repetitions that might otherwise have been avoided. I have no disposition whatever to call your attention to anything but the facts brought out which some of our people are not familiar with, and trust that the critical eye may pass over with a degree of charity the composition and the arrangement of the different points in the arguments, but would solicit the most careful and prayerful consideration of the arguments and conclusions.

## A Straight Talk to Old Brethren

---

In all my life I never attempted to spread my views upon paper in the form of a tract or a book of any kind, for I believed most thoroughly that I could not do it without showing the weakest point of my make-up. I never claimed any skill in the use of the pen, even in my younger days, when my mind was clear and memory active, and to attempt it now at my age, writing with my left hand,—as my right hand has failed me,—looks like presumption.

But I fell into it on this wise: I attended some of Elders Jones' and Rupert's meetings, referred to in this pamphlet, and found myself each evening after hearing them, before retiring, analyzing their positions and making a few notes.

This I did for my own personal satisfaction not even thinking of giving publicity to these strictures. But it kept growing in my mind till I said, "I will get these typewritten and let some of my friends, who are bewildered to some extent by these men, read it." I did so, and the circumstances and influences brought to bear of which I need not speak pushed me to take another step very hesitatingly, wishing that some one who had some gift to write might take these facts and set them forth in a readable form. But I knew such persons were busy with their hands full. Then I thought it possible that they might look at it in a little different light, as men often do. To illustrate: I very frequently go out to my farm and it is very fine, nice and level road with the exception of a few little stony points, quite steep and abrupt and full of these little round-headed stones, and I wondered why the authorities did not have them removed. I could not drive a buggy along there without being very much annoyed. So one day I determined to get out and remove them. While engaged in doing this, one of the old settlers came along and said, "Hello, sir, are you the road commissioner?" "No sir." "Do you

live in this district?" "No, sir, but I like smooth, nice roads and I can't see why you fellows don't remove these little mean and very annoying stones." "Well," says he, "may be if you knew as much about this stony point as we do perhaps you would not wonder. You will find in a few days just as many stones rolling around on the surface as there are here today." "Well, it will not be that way when I come back today, will it?" But he says, "I can't vouch for it, for every loaded wagon that comes along strikes one of these little stones and sets it a rolling as this hill is just full of them. Now," says he, "there is only one of two ways to do—either remove the hill or haul in enough good soil to cover it up so deep that these miserable little annoyances will not appear, and further," he says, "twenty-five years ago this road was perfectly smooth but quite abrupt. But time and usage has worn off the smooth surface and we have got down to what this hill is made of." "Well, it looks like you are about right, and I understand it better. While you discourage me a little I have one thing to console me and that is that I have had some satisfaction in looking down the road with these stones removed, even if worse ones should appear. I will not attempt to move the hill. I assure you I will leave that to Him who made it; then I can get along with this hill better than to have a big hole left in the road, and the other alternative is too big a job for me." So it might be in this case.

Then there was another thing that encouraged me to speak my mind. That was, I am not the head, beginning or end of anything in the denomination, and never had been an author or editor for this people, and so I thought I was perfectly safe, believing that Eld. Jones would know that it would be of no credit to his championship as editor, author, and a great and noted evangelist to load his rhetorical gun and shoot me down. The very fact that the odds were so great would prove that an effort of this kind would be a confession of the weakness of his cause, for I have nothing but a sling and am securely fortified behind "Jones No. 1," so you see he dare not fire for he cannot without firing into him and he

will never do that till he confesses that he has changed and I see that he is very loath to do that. So the Elder well knows that it will be the part of wisdom and consistency to keep quiet.

I have stated and restated, quoted and requoted the evidence, facts, and exhibits with different thoughts before us so as to get more than one viewpoint. I invite the consideration of the reader to the facts, rather than the composition and manner of statement.

There can be no question in the mind of every sincere believer of God's Word that there is a special work or message to go to the world just before Christ comes as set forth in Rev. 14:6-14; and we see that message must embrace all of God's commandments and all of the faith of Jesus. But take all of the movements of the reformers and we fail to find all of these specifications met in any one of them. But here at a specified time, as set forth in the prophetic word, is a people just coming into notice claiming to have these very things. They proclaim the Sabbath, with all the rest of the law; the coming of the Lord; the end of the world; the sleep of the dead; the end of the wicked; the resurrection; life only through Christ; saints' inheritance; repentance; conversion; justification through faith; and all the ordinances of the Lord's house with the gifts of the spirit,—with the Third Angel's Message which embraces it all as their battle cry. This, of course, embraces temperance, rightful habits of living, with all the true gospel methods of carrying on their work including organization which is to go to the ends of the earth. A message of this importance, embracing so much, having a prominent place in prophecy would it not justify God, who prepares individuals for special work, in doing that very thing in this case?

This is the most solemn message in the Bible. It is to ripen the harvest of the earth. The last message to a fallen world to prepare a people for translation by the most heart-searching reformation.

In a special work of this kind and even of less importance God has always selected some individual or individuals to take the lead to begin the work and carry



it on and get it on a proper foundation. God chose a fit man to warn the world about the deluge and he prosecuted the work to a successful finish. Take the exodus: this also required a man of unswerving integrity, superior in mental power, a leader, an organizer of great capacity, a man of a masterly mind, a great thinker, a good financier,—Moses, a very humble, devoted, consecrated servant of his God. Just so when the Jews were to be delivered from their Babylonish captivity a man now was needed in whom the Jews had great confidence and had great persuasive powers so as to influence the Persian king, and Ezra was the man. He overcame the great obstacles and Jerusalem was built again. And so at the first advent God had a man made ready—John the Baptist who realized that he was fulfilling a prophecy: “I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.” The protestant world all believe God raised up Luther to do a mighty work. A man that just fitted the occasion, a man of an iron will, great courage, strong mind, and deeply devotional; a man able to meet any and all opposition; a man who could combine and generalize rapidly. Miller was a special agent of God’s to awaken the world on the great question of the soon-coming of our Lord and thus to give the first message. These men were all great leaders, well balanced men, ready for almost any emergency; not one-sided men, but all-around men.

But one says: “Christ is our leader.” That is right. So was Christ the leader in the days of Moses, Ezra, Nehemiah, yet God chose these men through whom to lead His people. Is it not reasonable to conclude that in forwarding the Third Angel’s Message, embracing so much in its folds, God would lay a special burden on some one or more to direct the work and lay a firm and solid foundation for its prosecution and completion? We all believe He did so.

Now let me say, you cannot find a single case from Adam to Moses, from Moses to Christ, from Christ to Luther, from Luther to Wesley, from Wesley on to Miller, where God laid a special burden upon a man to do a special work, to commence it, where such a one apostatized

and went back or led off in a wrong course, so it became necessary to take some one else up to correct his errors and finish the work. Now what we claim is, God put these men to whom we have referred, in a leading position and that is what we claim for this movement which has been going on ever since 1844, and nothing more. Now we don't believe that one of those principal founders, who has taken a leading part in that work, has ever been known to apostatize from the cause and so turn the whole movement away from the original foundation or course. While we speak of all these parties as leaders, yet we do not believe one of them ever usurped the place of Christ. They were human beings and all had their imperfections and made mistakes, but not of that kind to change the cause to a wrong channel. The above facts to which attention has long since been called, have stood as faithful sentinels at the door of my heart and guarded me from these uprisings. Look these points over carefully again and again till you become familiar with them and so make them your own and you will find them a great protection against the assaults of the enemy on this subject.

Now let us apply these things to our work. Is it so, that the foundation here laid by our leaders is so incompatible with truth that we need to commence over again and start a new one on a different line; entirely new and different and so eliminate this plank and that one from the foundation and put in one contrary and incompatible with the old? Now that would be a very different matter from simply additional light added for that would not say the old was wrong, but right as far as it goes.

Did God allow this work to go on for seventy years based on a wrong foundation and wait for some of our number after staying with us for twenty-five years or more to become disgruntled, before they could see our errors and thus become great reformers? Is it not more likely that such men as J. N. Andrews, Father Bates, Eld. and Mrs. White had it right, without means, without position, without churches, and hence without influence, with everything in the message to be searched out and defended

and, to all human appearance, with no hope of success? It was genuine faith in God and the message that inspired hope, for their faith in this message was strong and their confidence great in its final triumph. So they went to work; prayed, traveled, and preached and met all kinds of objections and opposition, and God greatly blessed their labors and their calls came from those who longed and prayed most earnestly for more of God's light and His love.

These God-fearing men from a small beginning established many printing houses and papers, periodicals, schools, academies, etc., as we will show hereafter, which looks so much like the Spirit's movings. And it is through some of these agencies that we have received this message. Mark the spirit that moved all these great leaders. It was not a belligerent spirit, a desire to down something else and that something else was all right, "all the wheels within the wheels till a wheel run over them." Then and not till then were they sure that it was a wheel of a great reformation that struck them.

You may think of Judas as a case against my position, that no leader of a great reformation, one that God had called to the work ever apostatized. 1st. It is a question whether God had called him to that work. 2nd. The apostles up to the time that he fell were simply in training, being tested like Moses in the desert, just getting ready for their work and before they took up their work on the day of Pentecost, Matthias was chosen to fill Judas' place. God tests such men thoroughly before He puts them into His work and has them ready when the time comes. In all these special movements referred to there was ample room for doubts and opportunity to get into trial. Plenty of things to get into trouble about.

It has always been so, why should we expect it to be different under the Third Angel's Message? It was so in the days of Moses and rebellions have been inaugurated and led by "famous men," so much so that the leaders of God's cause trembled and feared. Famous men of renown princes two hundred and fifty of them, popular men in that great congregation, men of superior wisdom, debaters, great speakers and orators I presume; they could

argue very convincingly that the movement was going to pieces unless a change was made and that Moses was taking to himself too much honor, too much authority, and hence these unjust things inspired them with a spirit of reformation. But what was the result? See context.

Now let us lay the history of these undoubted movements inspired by God by the side of our history. As I have been connected with our work for nearly fifty years and have traveled in many of the states, serving on the General Conference Committee and connected in various ways, I personally know many of these things myself.

Seven different papers have been started to carry on a rebellious work against the Third Angel's Message. I may not be able to give them in the exact order. Ransom Hicks was the first I remember who turned away on a very small point and so began war upon us, but not till his position was condemned. He started a paper in Rhode Island called "The Voice of the East." He was sure that God had called him to do a great work. He got a good many subscribers, as all that were disaffected rallied to his help, but its life was short and that movement went down.

Then a man by the name of Lonsdale, in the same state, started another paper for the same purpose, called "The Voice of Truth." But that "voice" was soon silenced.

About that time, 1855, the "Review" was moved to Battle Creek, Mich. Then the "Messenger" party, a much stronger party led by Stevenson and Hall, strong men, famous, and men of renown among us arose. Their paper was called "The Messenger of Truth." They were sure that the Bible taught the "age to come" doctrine and they wanted the Third Angel's Message to accept of it, but when it could not do it then they opened fire on us. A number of ministers went into it and a number of our church members in different states became bewildered and went into it and of course all the odds and ends of these other uprisings. They made a grand rally everywhere and these unconsecrated and rebellious souls who saw these other efforts fail hailed this move with great



delight. Some of their admirers were good people, and were of course honestly deceived and so after they got a clear view of it all they came back. You remember the text in Acts 5: "If it be not of God it will come to naught." So confusion and division soon separated them and they could not agree who was to be the greatest. The leaders soon found that there was not enough consecration to sustain the paper and so the paper stopped, the party went down, and the leaders made shipwreck of their faith.

But this was not enough to satisfy this rebellious element. "Rebellion is as the sin of withcraft." I Sam. 15:23. It dies hard. The next was Elder Cramner in Michigan. He opened up another office after the "Messenger" closed its doors and called his paper "The Hope of Israel." Then came another big rally from Maine to Minnesota around this great leader. They made quite a showing, forming conferences in different states. "Now we will show you how to succeed," they said, but soon they began to crumble and went down—so the "Hope of Israel" was gone. Now not all of that party gave up all of their faith. It was just so with all of them, and of course they were ready and waiting to join the next secession movement which came in my state, Iowa, about the year 1865, striking me at a time of very limited experience. I had read myself into the truth, no Sabbath-keepers near me. I was in college at the time. Elds. Snook and Brinkerhoff were the preachers. Eld. Snook was the president of the conference. I had never met them and as yet had never attended a meeting till I went to Pilot Grove where that meeting was held, investigating their cases. There were present Bro. and Sister White and Bro. Loughborough and these persons had met to investigate this rebellion. This was my first meeting as these two men referred to were the only preachers in Iowa and hearing about them being smart, eloquent, smooth and educated men of the first class, my sympathies went out to them, but as I retired to myself and analyzed the points brought out, I soon made up my mind that they were wrong. The majority of the brethren at that camp meeting were in sympathy with these two men as they had

visited a number of the Iowa churches and had the good-will and sympathies of the members, especially on this subject, the testimonies, of which they had expressed their unbelief. There were lesser lights. Dan Hull (not the great Moses Hull), but his brother and Shortridge. But Snook and Brinkerhoff had full sway in our state at that time. However, Elder White met them face to face and exposed their fallacies. This investigation went on for several days, but at last these men surrendered. Now I will give their confessions in their own words. The following from the pen of W. H. Ball was published in the "Review" of July 7, 1868:

### A CONFESSION.

"With deep humility would I confess to the readers of the 'Review' my errors and mistakes in opposing what I now regard as the work of God. For more than two years I have been engaged in open warfare against certain positions held by our seventh-day brethren. My object has been to tear down, to dishearten, discourage, and cause doubt and unbelief everywhere (so far as my influence extends,) among this people. I have also put forth my best efforts to prejudice and influence first-day Adventists against this people and their views. I now see my mistake and deeply feel my wrong course in so doing. Nothing but Satan himself could induce me to engage in such an unholy warfare. I have been blinded by his dark influence, and controlled by his satanic power, while warring against the people of God. All this I frankly and humbly confess. I am guilty before God of a great sin, in uniting my influence and talents with the rebel hosts in opposing God's chosen people, who keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. I humbly ask the forgiveness of God and my brethren for the wrongs I have committed while engaged in this rebellious work. . . .

"It is my settled conviction, not only from the sad experience I have had in this matter, but from daily observation, that no weapon raised against the testimonies of this godly woman, can prosper. God's frown and not his blessing, will attend all such efforts. If others think they

can fight the visions, and enjoy the favor of Heaven at the same time, they can try it. But for one I am satisfied with this kind of work. I pray God to forgive me my errors in this direction.

"I also feel that I have committed a great wrong in holding up S. D. Adventists and their views to scorn and ridicule before their enemies. That my articles have partaken too much of the spirit of war, is too evident. What if our S. D. Adventist brethren do hold some errors! Where is there a people who do not? I am bold to affirm that there is no class of people to be found that have more truth than S. D. Adventists. There is no people to be found that are putting forth greater efforts to gain the immortal inheritance than S. D. Adventists. There is no people who are more zealous to get right in the sight of God, and keep all his commandments (the fourth not excepted), and get ready for translation, than S. A. Adventists. There is no people who are trying to conform to the laws of their being, so as to possess healthy bodies and clear minds, like S. A. Adventists. In short, there is no people I should be willing to cast in my interests with, but S. D. Adventists.

"In view of these facts, how wicked and unchristian the act to take the faults of this people (if faults they have), and hold them up to the gaze of those who disregard the law of God, the great rule of right, the perfect standard by which men are to be judged in the last day. Jas. 2:12.

"I feel deeply my wrong in warring against my seventh-day brethren. I have been led on by Satan in this unholy work, until I fear my influence has turned souls away from the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. I wish to counteract, as far as possible, my wrong influence, and would deeply humble myself before God, and seek forgiveness for all my wrongs, while Jesus pleads in behalf of the sins and errors of his people.

"W H. Ball.

"Washington, N. H."

Shortly after the visit of Bro. and Sr. White to Iowa, in July, 1865, Messrs. S. and B. prepared the following

statements which appeared in the "Review" of the 25th of the same month:

FROM B. F. SNOOK.

"Bro. White: Permit me, an unworthy worm of the dust, to address the brethren and sisters as follows:

"1. I wish to relieve my mind before you, and my God, by confessing that I now feel that I have been led by the wicked one in my movements of late, especially in my opposition to the body. Apparent difficulties in relation to Sr. White's visions have been accumulating in my mind for some time. These were magnified by the enemy until doubts resulted in unbelief and rebellion. In this distressed state of mind I attended the General Conference at Battle Creek, last May. While there, my mind was impressed that the church there was fast becoming conformed to the world. Without unbosoming myself to the brethren there, and calling for an explanation, I kept these matters to myself till I had a good opportunity to give vent to my feelings by publishing these matters which were a trial to me, to the brethren away from there. I am now convinced that the church at Battle Creek fellowship none of the extravagant fashions that I saw there, and I am now led to believe that they are doing what they can to live out the truth and preserve the waymarks of our faith.

"I wish to say to my good brethren and sisters of the Battle Creek church, that I do most deeply deplore this wrong, and humbly beg of them to forgive me. I also beg the pardon of Bro. and Sister White for the influence that I have tried to exert against them on account of these things. I also entreat my brethren and sisters in Iowa to forgive me for talking these things to them, and thereby inflaming them to wrong feelings. I do most sorrowfully repent of this grievous wrong, and pray that God and my brethren may forgive me.

"2. I went to the Iowa Conference full of opposition and strongly fortified against Sr. White's visions. Bro. White took a bold, decided and thorough stand against my wrongs, and faithfully exposed them. And though



my mind was very much blinded, the scales fell off and I began to see myself a poor, miserable and undone sinner. Awful conviction seized me, and I was unhappy day and night. Then God in mercy began to restore me from my crazy opposition, and I began to realize that I was the wrong one. In my distress I determined to confess my sins. I thereupon felt relief; and at the first opportunity I began the work; and as my determinations were carried out, I felt the blessing of God return to me.

"I desired to make everything right so fast as I could. But there were the visions so full of imaginary wrongs and difficulties, how could I get right on them? I listened to the mighty testimonies of Bro. and Sister White, driven home to my heart by the power of God. Hard as I had made my heart, it had to break, and well up with many tears that gushed from my eyes. Thought I, can it be possible that these who speak with so much Spirit and power of God are deceivers, are impostors? No, no! Such a thing cannot be. God will not bless the devil's servants with so much of his Spirit. I then felt the good Spirit of God upon my heart, and the more of that Spirit I felt, the better the visions appeared; and the discrepancies and difficulties soon began to take wings and fly away. I now believe firmly that the devil was working upon me for my overthrow and ruin. But I rejoice that God directed Bro. and Sister White this way. They truly have been instrumental in my salvation from the devil's snare. I hereby entreat their pardon for the grievous trial and heart-rending anguish that I have so wickedly brought upon them. May all my brethren, and may God forgive me.

"3. I have also felt while in this state of darkness that I was hampered and chained, and longed for a freedom that I now see would result in anarchy and universal disorder. I felt that the General Conference Committee were too domineering, and were fast becoming a kind of triune papacy. Let me say that I have no such feelings now. I believe that God is in our present system and arrangement of order, and my heart's desire is to conform to it unreservedly, and to live in subjection to God and

my brethren of experience in this work. I do most heartily believe that this work, in all its parts, is the work of God, and by his divine aid, I am going to strive to be a more holy, humble and devoted man, that I, with mine, may go with this people to the kingdom of God.

"Your unworthy brother,

"B. F. S."

FROM W. H. BRINKERHOFF.

"To the Battle Creek Church of S. D. A.: Brethren —With feelings of my unworthiness and liability to run into the devices of the enemy of all good, I send to you the following confession. And although mere words cannot heal wounds that have been inflicted, yet I hope that by actions in the future I may cause the injuries inflicted to be healed.

"On the 16th of May, 1865, I visited your place to attend the General Conference, with my mind poisoned to a considerable extent against you, and hence I was on the lookout to see if I could not find something by which I might have the wherewith to reproach you.

"After the Conference, my mind being still more poisoned, when I arrived home I began to circulate impressions of what I had seen in Battle Creek, among my brethren in Iowa, such as that the church was getting proud, and fashionable, and were not following out the testimonies. I saw individuals with fashionable hats and bonnets, and artificials in them, but did not stop to inquire whether they were of Battle Creek or not, but in my state of mind conveyed the idea that they were all of your place. Since I have come into a position where I could stop and reflect and investigate, I am satisfied that said insinuations and reflections were wrong, and that I have by my influence placed you in a false position before the brethren of Iowa.

"Brethren, I have been deeply under the influence of Satan, and in this condition, I have done you a great wrong and wounded the cause severely, and while you were so kind in taking care of me and providing for all my wants, I was preparing to inflict wounds upon you.

"Oh may God in mercy pity and forgive me that great wrong. Of all wrongs committed, none are more flagrant than mercies abused. Oh how could I do so! Yet I did it, I did it!

"In order that I may place you in your true position before the brethren, let me say that I was in the wrong, and not you. I think I can today survey the critical position I was in. And although I have acted so cruelly and altogether unwarranted toward you, and while I would not extenuate myself, yet permit me to say that I was poisoned in my mind toward you, and blinded by prejudice. Yet I ought not to have been in such a position. I should not have given place to the enemy.

"And now may I hope that when you see in me a consistent course of conduct, and that I am trying to make amends for my faults, I may hope for your forgiveness, and to be restored again to your confidence. I will try to find out my place in the message, and struggle more earnestly to live out the truth. And may the Lord forgive me all my sins.

"To Bro. and Sister White I would say, I have also deeply wronged you, and caused you much anguish of heart and mind. I have listened to reports against you, and although while at Battle Creek enjoying your hospitalities, I had a good opportunity to talk with you about said reports, I waited until I came home, then began to spread them, thus alienating the minds of the brethren away from you. I did not stop to investigate them, and while you were far away I was trying to injure you. Oh, why did I do so! You had never harmed me in any way.

"On the 30th of June I went to Pilot Grove to meet you and Bro. Loughborough, not as brethren, but as enemies; and while there trying to fight my own way through, you fully sustained your reputation as honest, consistent Christians under the Third Angel's Message. Oh! I feel sad when I think how I have been working for the enemy. Can such wounds be healed! such stains be washed out! I am now fully satisfied that God is leading this people, and that the visit of Bro. and Sister White, and Bro. Loughborough, was not only timely, but blessed

of God, and under his guidance; and that great good has already resulted therefrom. I went there without any confidence in the testimonies of Sister White, and also with doubts on our position in regard to the sanctuary. I would now say that my feet are taken out of the miry clay, and fixed upon the sure foundation of truth, the testimonies not excepted.

"And here I freely confess to you, that I have not only deeply injured you, but also the cause of truth. Words alone are a poor balm for wounds. But if you can still regard me as a brother, though an erring one, I will try to adorn the truth I profess, with a godly walk and conversation in the future. And may the Lord forgive me my sins, and strengthen me in every good word and work.

"To the brethren in Iowa I would say, My feet had well nigh slipped, and I was fast losing sight of the landmarks of truth. You that I have had an influence upon while in this state of darkness and doubt, I ask your forgiveness. And let me here say, that my experience, though a sad one, has taught me that to doubt this truth, and the instrumentalities used to bring it out by the Lord, is to speedily lead one into the enemy's dark dominions, where he can be taken captive at his will. Oh, doubt not this truth. Fear not its ultimate results. Put not forth your hands to steady the ark, as I thought to do. And though angry waves may roll high, God will take care of this truth, and bless its upbuilders, and send confusion and weakness upon those who, like some people anciently, thought to stay the work of God. I shall try in the future to humbly follow on where the Lord may lead. Pray for me.

"Yours hoping for eternal life,

"W. H. B.

"Lisbon, Iowa, July 12, 1865."

But in a very short time they relapsed into rebellion, so the last state of these men was worse than the first. Now a new and more formidable party than any of their predecessors was organized and again all the remnants of these other parties who had just life enough

to hold on and oppose us came to the front inspired with another installment of faith. I have often heard that a poor, bewildered soul could believe his doubts with greater intensity than he ever did his beliefs. Many of these poor people would feel that their life's work was done if they could not oppose this work in some form. These men divided a large number of our churches, and so got a large number of sympathizers to follow them. They boasted that in a short time there would not be a corporal's guard of us left. But what next?

They bought the remains of the office of the "Hope of Israel" in Michigan and moved it over to Iowa and commenced to publish the sixth paper of the seven to which I have referred, and soon they had their work going very encouragingly (to read their reports). Churches were organized, conferences formed, and things set going. Never were things so hopeful before. They were told very plainly the danger of striking off on a tangent like this, the danger of making complete shipwreck of their faith. Soon their paper commenced to question one point after another till they gave up our views on the sanctuary, then the two-horned beast, then the Third Angel's Message. Then the next thing we knew Brinkerhoff had given it all up, Sabbath and all. The great leader who was introducing the great reform in this work (inspired by what, let his confession tell) had apostatized, gone into universalism. Then very soon Dan Hull and Shortridge went over to spiritualism. This left them without a leader and in a desperate condition they were willing to take into their fold almost anything.

At this point Eld. Nathan Fuller came from Pennsylvania, a talented man who had been found guilty of the most debasing sins or crimes. Notwithstanding all that they took him in, hoping of course, he would do better, but to their horror they soon were just as glad to get rid of him. Then Goodenough, from Wisconsin, a man with some ability who was dropped from our ranks for his crookedness, claimed to have changed his former views and embraced theirs and so flourished as a great man and they thought sure they had found their leader.

After dividing two or three churches of ours I am glad to say they had integrity left among them sufficient to silence this unworthy man, though he boasted that the Battle Creek branch was fast going to pieces and they were becoming stronger and stronger every day—said they had forty preachers doing good work.

But at that time it seemed that all the evidence of worthiness needed was to have something to say against the Seventh-day Adventists. They professed great freedom and liberty—so much so that you would see one article teaching the wicked would never be raised, then another denying it; one teaching age to come and another denying; so with the two-horned breast. Then who could know what they believed? Almost every subject had its advocates and opponents. This is the way it used to be—I hear it is different now. I want to see their paper. Now if they had kept on as they started—fighting God's cause at every turn, like their five predecessors, they too would have gone down like Korah's company. Their leaders were all gone and had given up their faith and, as I understand it, the little paper went down at one time but was resurrected by an individual and so lives, and may be if they keep their hands off the ark and let the Third Angel's Message alone they may be able to maintain its feeble existence.

Now I said seven papers to my knowledge had appeared. There may be some foreign ones that I am not acquainted with. Out of that seven five are fallen, one is, and another is coming, and I want to quote a little from the sixth and seventh to show that the object of their existence seems to be to hinder our work and misrepresent our leaders and harass their minds as much as possible.

I quote as proof an editorial of the "Bible Advocate" about March 15, 1877, which says:

"It may not be very interesting to read the controversial matter relating to Seventh-day Adventists as an organized body to those who have known but little or nothing of them and their workings. But when it is remembered that many of our readers were once con-

connected with that organization and have suffered by the oppression that the leaders of that party bear over their people and the mental thralldom that they are under from that organization and the many that are yet so bound, the duty of exposing them is apparent." So that is their mission, and we see from what the others did—the five that preceded this one—that their work was just the same.

I have belonged to this body of Seventh-day Adventists fifty years and I don't know anything of this oppression of its leaders only what I have referred to and that was short-lived, and I know I was never under any mental thralldom to the organization and I think if there was anything of that kind I should have discovered it long ago. I presume there are some people in the United States who have been doing about as they pleased and cared not whether the United States was pleased or not that are under mental as well as physical thralldom, and they think the authorities are oppressive. But I have had perfect liberty both in the United States and the organization and as much as I want. So I have had perfect liberty to write this article and say what I thought should be said. Suppose the leaders should differ with me, should they not have their liberty to think that way? And then suppose I keep it up year in and year out till they think I am injuring their cause, should they not have the liberty to let the public know that I was not representing them as a body in this work, as I was a member of that body? And if I persisted in it should they not disconnect me to save the body and convince me that I had taken a wrong course? That does not take away my liberty to write more articles. Then why should I go all over the country complaining that I had been cast out when I had the same liberty that a much more noted and prominent personage had when he was cast out to go right on with his work? If that editorial had been written at the time when Elder Jones was a leader I would confess it would have had some grounds for its statement (though he was not president). He would and did lead. He took that responsibility, especially after he was elected on the General Conference Committee.



I might cite some things to illustrate this point, but I forbear. However, I said to some of my old brethren, "If Jones stays with the Third Angel's Message he will have to change."

We have seen all these moves referred to professing great liberty, so they could do just what they pleased to do and they carried it so far that it compelled them to allow anything their professed friends pleased to write to go into their paper. So all kinds of doctrines went through it, even though they knew they were not true. So you see the enemy of all truth had an organ through which he could speak. That paper is just the same today on this point.

Now look at the one just arising, "The Gathering Call," December, 1913, says: "It should seem that even by your constant reiteration you would find difficulty in convincing of the truth of your words, anybody who is not under an ecclesiastical hoodoo. And as for those who are under such hoodoo how could anything but general inefficiency be expected of them? You have read into the very Bible itself a number of things that are not in any sense true; that are shown to be false by the plain words of the Bible; and so far as the denomination is concerned it seems you did get away with this as the other, but that you should be able to get away with such a brazen thing, as this latter is sufficient evidence how far the denomination has been led away from any real care for what the Bible does say or teach. In the wish that both you and the Seventh-day Adventist denomination may yet find a real Christian care for the genuine openness and sincerity of the truth and for what the Bible does really say, I remain, etc., A. T. Jones."

Then in this same article: "When for years you have been greedily doing the very thing you here refused to do and now seek to cover all by assuming this new holy attitude the thing will not work." The following statement which is of the same character will show what he (Jones) refers to: "I know perfectly well that you cannot truthfully tell of any truth that I have given up or gone off from, and you know this too, and furthermore

the impression you have helped and tried to create that there ever was any such a thing was false from the beginning and you knew it."

These accusations were made against Eld. W. A. Spicer and the denomination. It is clear to me that these accusations grew out of a bad or darkened state of mind and always characterizes those who are in rebellion against light and knowledge. What the elder states here to be false I shall show hereafter is true, by his own words. Yet Elder Spicer chooses to keep silent and bear this railing accusation rather than to attempt a reply which can be made to the humiliation of the accuser. Now look at these words again: "You have been greedily doing." What? What Elder Jones says "is false" and further what "you [Spicer] cannot truthfully tell and you know this."

I now call attention to some of our experiences here at College View.

For sometime past we have been entertained by a traveling quartette, men of no mean ability, and who once were in the front ranks of the Seventh-day Adventists—ministers, authors, and editors. The chief attraction of their "song" is their chorus. The largest share of their audience seem to enjoy it very much, and they do without doubt make it attractive by bringing it in at the end of almost every strain. It is summarily expressed in the following verses:

"That I am right and always right, I know  
Because my own convictions tell me so.  
I reverence the good, old Book, you see  
When it is translated and explained by me.  
By churchly laws and customs I abide,  
If in my opinion they coincide.  
Now to be right is simply this to say,  
That I shall oppose and expose S. D. A's."

One of these men is here simply by proxy. His argument is given in a pamphlet, "The Evening and the Morning," authorized and written by M. E. Kellogg. He makes an attack upon us concerning the sanctuary ques-

tion, which if we get it rightly fixed in our minds we will have to make a desperate effort to get on the wrong track; and if we have a wrong view, we will find it almost impossible to get on the right track. I mean in the Third Angel's Message for these last days. This, the 2300 days, is a central point. But this man applies it to Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the Syrian kings of the Grecian kingdom. After correcting the question asked in Daniel 8:13, page 46, he then says the next question is as to the correctness of the 2300 days, and so makes it only 2200 days. Next he says it is not a question of days at all, but the thing done on these days, or in the evening and the morning, (page 99.) He shows it is only 1100 days, (page 52;) then corrects two of his witnesses—Josephus and Millman, (page 51.) Then after all these corrections, he thinks he has brought all within the pale of certainty, and so it would be only one chance in a million to be wrong, (page 109.) Then he endeavors to show that these 1100 days were fulfilled to the letter by this king, Antiochus Epiphanes, in profaning the Jewish temple, etc. The reason that I refer to this is that one of his ardent believers told me that there were at least twenty persons who believe this in this place, and they are attending, at least a part of them, these meetings now going on. I believe that M. E. Kellogg, without doubt, has the best showing in his arguments of any of the four, while he places the 2300 days all fulfilled before Christ came the first time.

Elder Rupert, one of the four, believes these 2300 days are prophetic days, not literal like M. E. Kellogg, and he also believes they cover all the gospel period clear down until Christ comes the second time, which days commenced in B. C. 301 and end in 1995 A. D., which he thinks brings the end of the world. So he can point out to you the very year when the end shall come; and in his preaching upon this subject, he endeavors to cast reflection on the idea that the sanctuary referred to is the heavenly sanctuary, (Dan. 8:11-14,) saying he believes it to be the earthly one, and that he can make it appear an absurdity to believe otherwise. In his sermon on this

subject, I asked him who the prince was that was spoken of in the 11th verse. He said, "Christ." I asked him who "his" referred to in the last line of this verse, where it was said, "Cast down the place of 'his' sanctuary." If that did not refer to this prince who was Christ? Then I said, by turning to Hebrews the 8th chapter we find where "his" sanctuary is located, which declares that it was a tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and "not man." Hence it is the heavenly sanctuary.

A voice in the audience: "Brother Morrison, it is the place of 'his' sanctuary cast down."

No difference. We are inquiring whose sanctuary it is. The question was, to whom does "his" refer?

No. See Jer. 17:11. A glorious high throne is the place of our sanctuary.

Elder Ballenger says the 2300 days closed in 1844, but the Seventh-day Adventists are wrong in locating the commencement of the atonement day at that time. He claims that it commenced at Christ's ascension, so he says in his book named "Cast-Out," and that the only thing that remained to be done was the atonement to be made with Satan at the close of the 2300 days, in 1844.

Kellogg advocates that when Christ enters the most holy place that probation is closed. His book, (page 19.) So he puts it up to us as a great objection that he thinks we cannot answer, and says as certainly as the 2300 days closed in 1844, so certainly does this prove that there has been no probation since that time, hence no conversions; yet Ballenger and Kellogg join in the chorus, even though Ballenger, according to Kellogg in his theory, has had no probation for 1900 years.

There is another one of the chorus, last but not least—Elder Jones. He says the Third Angel's Message, which is now due, is to oppose and expose the movement of church federation, on principle and by the Scriptures. and he says that that is now due, and says that he will preach it. (See his leaflet, "Appeal," pp. 59-60.) He says that the Seventh-day Adventist organization is more of a federation and confederation than the sweeping movement of church federation will be in five years from

now. Then the Third Angel's Message is to oppose and expose Seventh-day Adventist organization, as it is five years in advance of this sweeping church federation. So you see he can join the chorus; in fact, he is the chorus itself. Yet he believes that the 2300 days ended in 1844, as he claims to believe the fundamentals of the Seventh-day Adventists. He offers as proof of the federation, a movement by the young people here in this place, because the young people's organization planned among themselves to visit all the homes in the village to find out their moral and spiritual standing, for the purpose of knowing how that they might bestow Christian work to the best advantage. It seems as though he had heard of some such a movement in other churches, and hence he called it "federation." So he posted up what he calls a thesis in the postoffice, something like this: "Non-Christian, Non-American, and Unconstitutional," while in reality that movement had no more to do with church federation than Wednesday night prayer meetings have to do with it, as other churches have prayer meetings Wednesday night. Elder Jones, in a sermon here, in fact a number of sermons, on the subject of organization, stated in question and answer, that he believed and preached the same on this subject that he always did,—yes, twenty years ago, just the same,—and that he preached this very same sermon at the General Conference, 1901, and Elder Daniells said there was light in it, and he must write it up and let the people have it, which he says he did. He said in this discourse that any church organized as the civil government is organized, going from municipal to county, from county to state, and from state to United States in organization was the Papacy, as the same thing runs through-out the Papal church from the lowest officer to the highest; then said that any other church which organized in the same way, showing that they had a head man who stood as the head, and to whom they looked and were amenable in any way, was not only like the Papacy, but is the Papacy itself, no man could serve in the capacity of president; no man knew enough and was good enough to serve in this capacity without interfering with the God-given liberty of the people.

I asked whom he meant. Any church that organized this way, the Seventh-day Adventists with the rest? I asked him how long he had believed this thing, twenty years? "Yes."

"Did you believe it when you were president of the California Conference?"

"Yes."

"Did you come between God and the people?"

"No."

"Then you knew enough, and were good enough to serve as president without interfering with the liberties of the people. Did you serve on the General Conference Committee at College View who nominated officers to fill the offices of the General Conference, such as president, etc.?"

"Yes."

"Did you believe this that you have preached tonight then?"

"Yes."

"Did you go to God and ask him to guide you in your committee work?"

"Yes."

"Did he guide you?"

"Yes."

"And you knew at the time that the nominating committees and elections, to which you refer in this sermon tonight, were contrary to God's order? And you asked the Lord in faith to guide, and you knew at the time it was contrary to God's order? Now tell us why you did that, and how you could do it, believing as you do tonight?"

"I thought the brethren would learn and would follow on afterward."

"Then you disregarded God's order to try to please the brethren, without telling them that you had known this for a long time, and had no faith in nominations or elections?"

Now, in order to understand and get at this matter clearly, I desire to call your attention to what Brother Jones preached fourteen years ago at South Lancaster,

and we will place that under exhibits A, B, C, etc., and we will call this Elder Jones No. 1, and what he now says here at College View and in the leaflet, "Appeal," we will call Jones No. 2.

I will go back not twenty years, but fourteen years, to the South Lancaster General Conference, and we will see what Jones No. 1 said on this same subject. Before we call your attention to his words, we will show that the subject of organization was the subject under discussion. E. J. Waggoner and others had been preaching in England some things very similar to what Jones No. 2 now preaches, but in a very modified form. He had received from Sister White a testimony of reproof for many things which he had said on this subject. We will call your attention now to the "Bulletin" which faithfully recorded many things said at that Conference, word for word report, and as he had accepted the reproof, Waggoner of course walked very softly over this subject. We will first quote from pages 91 and 92 of the "Bulletin," giving testimonies read at that Conference:

"Oh, how Satan would rejoice to get in among this people, and 'disorganize' the work at a time when 'thorough organization' is essential, and will be the greatest power to keep out spurious uprisings, and to refute claims not endorsed by the word of God! We want to hold the lines evenly, that there shall be no breaking down of the system of regulation and order. In this way license shall not be given to disorderly elements to control the work at this time. We are living in a time when order, system, and unity of action are most essential."—Testimony for Ministers and Workers, No. 3, pages 60-61.

"Just now is the time when the perils of the last days are thickening around us, that we need wise men for counselors,—not men who will feel it their duty to stir up and create disorder, and who cannot possibly give wise counsel, but who can so organize and arrange that every stirring up shall bring order out of confusion, and rest and peace in obeying the word of the Lord."—Special Testimonies Relating to Various Matters in Battle Creek, page 19.



"He [Waggoner, I think] has brought before some of the people ideas in regard to organization that ought never to have had expression. I supposed that the question of organization was settled forever with those who believed the Testimonies given through Sister White. Now if they believe these matters, why do they work contrary to them? Why should not my brethren be prudent enough to place these matters before me, or at least to inquire if I had any light upon these subjects? \* \* \* O, how Satan would rejoice to get in among this people, and disorganize the work at a time when thorough organization is essential."—Mrs. E. G. White, Jan. 14, 1894. X

"It is nearly forty years since organization was introduced among us as a people. I was one of the number who had an experience in establishing it from the first. I know of the difficulties that had to be met, the evils which it was designed to correct; and I have watched its influence in connection with the growth of the cause. At an early stage in the work, God gave us special light upon this point; and this light, together with the lessons that experience has taught us, should be carefully considered.  
\* \* \*

"As our numbers increased, it was evident that without some form of organization, there would be great confusion, and the work would not be carried forward successfully. To provide for the support of the ministry, for carrying on the work in new fields, for protecting both the churches and the ministry from unworthy members, for holding church property, for the publication of the truth through the press, and for many other objects, organization was indispensable."—"General Conference Daily Bulletin," Jan. 29, 1892. (Elder Jones believed and endorsed this at that time.)

I will quote now from page 85 of the "Bulletin" to show further that the subject of organization was under discussion. E. J. Waggoner speaks:—

"I want to read a short extract from a letter recently received. Here is the statement: 'Our present form of church government, which I hope at some time will be changed.' Here is another expression in this letter about

the 'necessity of modifying the form of our church government.' All this may be true enough: I might say that one recommendation of the letter was that the General Conference Committee ought to be abolished, also the district superintendents."

Page 86: Eld. Waggoner: "This question of organization is a very simple thing. \* \* \*

"Several questions have been asked me, that I cannot remember just now; but I want to say that I am just this much of a heretic on organization, that if I had the privilege of changing this whole thing, I could not put forth my hand to change a single item. \* \* \*

"No, I would not; because I should make a mistake, no doubt."

Page 87, E. J. Waggoner: "I do not know of any difficulty. I have no difficulty."

A. F. Ballenger: "Doctor, there are a good many people here in this room today, good people too—"

Voice in the congregation: "How do you know?"

A. F. Ballenger: "Because they have repented of their sins. They are perplexed today. They are troubled in their minds. They cannot see today things that are being presented, and they are bearing it patiently."

E. J. Waggoner: "Let me make a confession. I made it in the last General Conference and I will repeat it. I received a Testimony several years ago stating that I had said things that ought not to be said. That was true."

A. F. Ballenger: "About organization?"

E. J. Waggoner: "I acknowledged it at that time, and I acknowledge it now. I stopped that thing just then."

This gives you something of an idea of Waggoner's attitude, yet he was trying to stop "that thing;" that is, saying and doing as he had done before he got the Testimony. Jones No. 1 was on the General Conference Committee at this time, Feb. 1899, and had been for some time, and by him and all of us, everything was accepted as set forth in these testimonies quoted here, notwithstanding that the General Conference Committee was re-

ceiving such heart-searching and withering rebukes and reproofs, for which he quotes from the Testimonies, saying that "I have not considered the voice of the General Conference the voice of God."

I will now give you what Jones No. 1 says at this Conference under exhibits, named A, B, C, etc., and will follow each exhibit with what Jones No. 2 says now, quoting from his leaflet "Appeal," also his sermons here. Remember, he claims that what he now preaches he has preached and believed for twenty years, and the same sermon, which he here preached at College View, he preached at the General Conference, 1901.

#### EXHIBIT A. THE PAPACY.

Jones No. 1: "You need not be afraid of the Papacy; for God is alive, and in the church. He is the head of the church, \* \* \* So nobody wants to talk about anarchy, or the Papacy, either; for the Lord Jesus Christ is in his church."—"Bulletin," page 63. 1899

Jones No. 2. "I do not know that this editorial in the 'Review and Herald' of June 3rd was aimed at the Papalistic procedure of the General Conference one week before. I hope it was."—"Appeal," page 52.

"I shall not follow the analysis further. I will only say that never in all the Middle Ages was there a more Papalistic thing purposed than this that was put through by the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference, May 26, 1909." Page 54.

"In the General Conference of 1903, I stated in this connection that though Israel several times started back to Egypt they never got there. But now it must be said that if this professedly Mosaic but truly Papal system shall be confirmed by this General Conference, then you will have gotten there: you will be back to Egypt; and the bonds and fetters and yokes 'that have been put upon God's people' will be confirmed instead of broken." Has Elder Jones changed?

#### EXHIBIT B. ORGANIZATION.

Jones No. 1: "The present organization is the Lord's

own, and He will preserve it."—"Bulletin," 1899, page 92. Considering all that has been said by Waggoner and others, he (Jones) says, "I have not heard a single suggestion that cannot be applied to the organization exactly as it is. Brother Waggoner told us here plainly that if God himself should give him the opportunity to remove whatever he thought should be removed, he would do nothing; for he would not know where to put his hand."

"You cannot destroy organization from among Seventh-day Adventists. If these brethren should set themselves to do it, they cannot do it. Jesus Christ is in the church. His testimony is in the church. He is the head of the church; the church belongs to him; and if nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of the church should set themselves to destroy organization from among the Seventh-day Adventists, they could not do it. The disorganizers would drop off, but the cause would go on gloriously. \* \* \* While we are dealing with these things, let us hold unto the light God has given us and He will lead us."—Page 93.

*Jones  
1899*

Remember he said Christ is in the church so you cannot destroy the organization of Seventh-day Adventists.

Jones No. 2: "The organized work of Seventh-day Adventists, as it now stands, can never oppose on principle nor by the Scripture, the now great and sweeping movement of church federation; for the Seventh-day Adventist 'organization' is more of a federation and confederation now than that other will be five years from now."—"Appeal," page 59.

"Now, the Catholic church is a single church with only a single organization of its own self and its own work alone, separate from all other churches. Therefore, as certainly as the Catholic church is a federation, then just so certainly the Seventh-day Adventist church, being only a single church, itself, and its own work organized as a single organization separate from all other churches, is likewise a federation." You see from this that we are just like the Catholics, notwithstanding it was the Lord's own in 1899 and organized just the same as now.

## EXHIBIT C. CHURCH.

Jones No. 1: "The Lord Jesus Christ is in the church; he is the head of the church, and he is going to live and remain in the church until the end of the world."—"Bulletin," page 63.

See also what he says in Exhibit B. (This present organization is his own and the Lord is in it.)

"Now the Catholic church is a single church, with only a single organization of its own self, and its own work alone separate from all other churches. Therefore, as certainly as the Catholic church is a federation, then just as certainly the Seventh-day Adventist church, being a single church itself and its own work organized as a single organization, free from all other organizations is likewise a federation, and is not the church of Christ."—"Appeal," page 59. (See Exhibit F, Jones No. 2.)

The Catholic church here is the same as the Seventh-day Adventist church, you see? But in Exhibit A must not talk about it being the Papacy. Has Jones changed?

Jones No. 2. "Not only like the Papacy, but is the Papacy," from sermon at College View. See also what he said in Exhibit A.—"You need not be afraid of the Papacy, for God is alive and in the church."

See also Exhibit B: "Jesus Christ is in the church; His testimony is in the church, and the church belongs to Him, is his own organized exactly as it is." You see he is talking about the present organization, and says "is His own \* \* \* and among Seventh-day Adventists." So these sayings cannot apply to the church above but right here on the earth.

## EXHIBIT D. VOICE OF GOD.

Jones No. 1. (Quotes Testimonies) "It has been some years since I have considered the General Conference as the voice of God." "That calls for such repentance as has never been shown yet. That calls for such repentance, brethren, by you and me, in this General Conference, as has not been seen among Seventh-day Adventists. \* \* \* As will restore God's confidence in

the General Conference as the voice of God? That is what he is saying. \* \* \* O, we must repent! When the cause of God has been carried to where God must disown us, and says He can no longer recognize the conference as His voice, what are our voices worth? So long as we are separated from God, what are our plans worth?" —"Bulletin," page 74.

Testimony says all of us are at fault. Page 74.

"I [Jones No. 1] am in it all now. I am a part of the General Conference; I want it so that God can recognize me as a part of His work \* \* \* It is a \* \* \* General Conference confession. \* \* \* It is a General Conference clearing of ourselves that is needed. \* \* \* Brethren shall we not confess?"—Page 75.

Elder Jones took the lead and called all the committees to come forward and all joined in prayer to God, which is recorded on pages 75 and 76 of the "Bulletin," Elder Jones closed his prayer by saying:

"Thou hast heard us. We thank thee for thy gift. We claim thy promise and we thank thee. Now, Lord, lead us to the end, for thy name's sake." He said before bowing, "Shall not this General Conference this afternoon, get clear of this wicked thing? Then when the nominating committee brings in the names of men to be put in position by this General Conference, it will name men of principle; men who fear God. When the committee have formulated the principles brought out by the conference, after they have prayed, and we have prayed for God to guide them, we will have the voice of the conference and it will be the voice of God. \* \* \* This is the way the brethren did at Jerusalem in the council." —"Bulletin," page 93.

So you see Jones No. 1 then believed that the decision of the conference was the voice of God. See Exhibit E, that he recognized that the General Conference were men of authority and their voice the voice of God. And this he said after they repented and said that God had heard us and given us light (p. 93) and he would not let us go to pieces. Elder Ballenger said at this time that we had repented.

## EXHIBIT E. AUTHORITY.

Jones No. 1. "You and I are to be the men because we are here. God has called us to this time, and this place, and has put us in places of authority and honor."—"Bulletin," page 75.

Jones No. 2. "No man, no association or combination of men, ever has any authority because of any official position or place in the church of Christ, or in any church professing to be the church of Christ; when any man or set of men ever does have it in any church, it is because that church is of men only and not of Christ."—"Appeal," page 25.

See when he was in it (Jones No. 1) he said of himself that he had been put in a place of authority, but he now says, "That such a church is a church of men only, and not of Christ," yet when he was in it, occupying a place of authority, "Christ was in it; His testimony was in it." (Page 93.) And it was then His church.

I now call your attention to "Sketches from the Life of Paul," page 42. "Both Paul and Barnabas had been laboring as ministers of Christ, and God had abundantly blessed their efforts; but neither of them had previously been formally ordained to the gospel ministry by prayer and the laying on of hands. They were now authorized by the church, not only to teach the truth, but to baptize, and to organize churches, being invested with full ecclesiastical authority. \* \* \*

"God foresaw all these difficulties which his servants would undergo, and, in his wise providence, caused them to be invested with unquestionable authority from the established church of God, that their work should be above challenge \* \* \*

"Their ordination was an open recognition of their divine mission, as messengers specially chosen by the Holy Ghost for a special work."

See Acts 23:3-6: "Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall; for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law? And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God's high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not,



brethren, that he was the high priest; for it is written, thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people."

We also have the case of David with Saul. We see that David recognized the authority of the anointed of the Lord, simply because he was in authority. Paul recognized the same, as you see above.

### EXHIBIT F. WHEELS.

Jones No. 1. "So the Lord will lead us: His hand will be upon everything and move all the wheels within the wheels, and nothing can get away from him."—"Bulletin," page 93.

Jones No. 2. Sermon at College View: "All this machinery, man-made as it is, after the order of the civil government, organized after this model,—municipal, subject to county, county subject to state, state subject to United States, with a president to which we are all amenable,—a church organized after this kind of a model is not after the due order of God, but is contrary to the New Testament order, and is not the church of Christ. The Seventh-day Adventist organization and the Catholic organization were organized alike, running from the lowest officer to the pope, from elders of churches, presidents of conferences, president of American Division, clear up to the president of the General Conference." And he claims we are subject to the president of the General Conference just as Catholics are to the pope.

But you see these "wheels within wheels" were all right in 1899, and God would not let any of them get away. So the machinery, with the wheels, was then needed and that organization machinery and wheels was all right.

As Jones No. 1 said: "There is a place for the organization which God has built up. He will preserve it."—"Bulletin," page 63.

"He is the head of the church, and he is going to live in the church until the end. \* \* \* "Bulletin," page 63.

"Do not be afraid, brethren \* \* \* The conference will get there, and the organization will get there,

and we will get there,"—"Bulletin," page 93.

You see by reading from the different exhibits that while Jones No. 1 believed in our organization then, he has now no place for organization of this kind,—wheels within wheels,—modeled after the Mosaic organization. He does not now believe that there is any place for such an organization as Seventh-day Adventists have; but in 1899 he believed that if "nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every one thousand in the church should attempt to destroy this organization from among Seventh-day Adventists, they could not do it, and the destroyers would drop off." Page 93. Does he preach this now? Nay, he has a very different Third Angel's Message. And if that then was the Third Angel's Message, this one now is not.

#### EXHIBIT G. MOSAIC ORDER.

Elder Irwin at this General Conference had prepared to speak on organization, and circumstances seemed to call for it. Elder Jones at that meeting, in my presence, looked over Elder Irwin's notes and quotations and encouraged him to go ahead and give it, as he had prepared it. Now we will give some of these quotations here of Elder Irwin's, quoted from "Gospel Workers," and that is a quotation from Vol. 1, pages 649-650-651.

"Ministers should love order, and should discipline themselves, and then they can successfully discipline the church of God and teach them to work harmoniously, like a well drilled company of soldiers. If order and discipline are necessary for successful action on the battlefield, the same are as much more needful in the warfare in which we are engaged as the object to be gained is of greater value and more elevated in character, than those for which opposing forces contend upon the field of battle. In the conflict in which we are engaged, eternal interests are at stake.

"Angels work harmoniously. Perfect order characterizes all their movements. The more closely we imitate the harmony and order of the angelic host, the more successful will be the efforts of these heavenly agents in our

behalf. If we see no necessity for harmonious action, and are disorderly, undisciplined, and disorganized in our course of action, angels, who are thoroughly organized and move in perfect order, cannot work for us successfully. They turn away in grief, for they are not authorized to bless confusion, distraction, and disorganization. All who desire the cooperation of the heavenly messengers, must work in unison with them. Those who have the unction from on high, will in all their efforts encourage order, discipline, and union of action, and then the angels of God can cooperate with them. But never, never will these heavenly messengers place their indorsement upon irregularity, disorganization, and disorder. All these evils are the result of Satan's efforts to weaken our forces, to destroy courage, and prevent successful action.

"Satan well knows that success can only attend order and harmonious action. He well knows that everything connected with heaven is in perfect order, that subjection and thorough discipline mark the movements of the angelic host. It is his studied effort to lead professed Christians just as far from heaven's arrangement as he can; therefore, he deceives even the professed people of God, and makes them believe that order and discipline are enemies to spirituality; that the only safety for them is to let each pursue his own course, and to remain especially distinct from bodies of Christians who are united, and are laboring to establish discipline and harmony of action. All the efforts made to establish order are considered dangerous, a restriction of rightful liberty, and hence are feared as papacy. These deceived souls consider it a virtue to boast of their freedom to think and act independently. They will not take any man's say so. They are amenable to no man. I was shown that it is Satan's special work to lead men to feel that it is God's order for them to strike out for themselves, and choose their own course, independent of their brethren.

"I was pointed back to the children of Israel. Very soon after leaving Egypt they were organized and most thoroughly disciplined. God had in his special providence qualified Moses to stand at the head of the armies of

Israel. He had been a mighty warrior to lead the armies of the Egyptians, and in generalship he could not be surpassed by any man. The Lord did not leave his holy tabernacle to be borne indiscriminately by any tribe that might choose. He was so particular as to specify the order he would have observed in bearing the sacred ark, and to designate a special family of the tribe of the Levites to bear it \* \* \* In all their journeyings they were required to observe perfect order. Every tribe bore a standard with the sign of their father's house upon it, and each tribe was required to pitch under its own standard. \* \* \*

"The travels of the children of Israel are faithfully described; the deliverance which the Lord wrought for them, their perfect organization and special order, their sin in murmuring against Moses and thus against God, their transgressions, their rebellions, their punishments, their carcasses strewn in the wilderness, because of their unwillingness to submit to God's wise arrangements,—this faithful picture is hung up before us, as a warning lest we follow their example of disobedience, and fall like them." Jones No. 1 claimed to believe the above at that time but see what he says now:

"There is, then, no possible room for question. That form of organization of the S. D. A. denomination is professedly that of the Mosaic order. To go back to the Mosaic order for any such purpose as that which is set forth in that official statement as to the organization of the S. D. A.'s is nothing else than to abandon Christ and the Christian order wholly. To ignore Christ and the Christian church, as that statement does, is the direct abandonment of Christ and the Christian order for Moses and the Mosaic order."—"Appeal," pp. 34, 35.

Paul says in the tenth chapter of 1st Corinthians: "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come."

One of this quartet in a sermon in reply to another discourse that had been given in the Adventist church at College View, endeavored to cast reproach upon the idea

that that perfect Mosaic organization was in any sense a type of Christ's church in this dispensation. He did this with a great effort endeavoring to show that the type to be a type had to walk, as it were, upon all fours, and everything that you could possibly put into the type must be met in the anti-type and vice versa. He said, after making this effort that he and his co-worker would be willing to go up on the campus and let the leaders or elders of this denomination cause the earth to open up and swallow them as a test. Yet they should know a type is a figure, something similar to, but there is not a type which is as near like the anti-type in all things as the tabernacle the sanctuary and its service, as one was modeled definitely after a definite pattern or anti-type. Yet Paul says in Hebrews, that even this is not a "perfect image." Heb. 10:1. As well might we say, as it is declared that Christ is our passover, 1 Cor.. 5:7, that to be our passover He had to fulfil all the details of the pass-over in Egypt and so the unbeliever might call on us to give them a test as to Christ being our Passover by destroying one from every home.

Another one of this quartet; namely, M. E. Kellogg, in his book, "Vision of the Evening and Morning," page 11, speaking in regard to the little horn of Daniel 8, in order to show a palpable absurdity of applying it to Rome, makes this statement: "The goat could fight with its horn, and did. The horn could not fight against the goat or overcome him. If it was a formidable horn, it was so on account of the strength of the goat pushing it. To believe the opposite is a palpable absurdity."

Now you see we have a figure here to represent a fact, and this same author tries to show that every detail and characteristic of the symbol must harmonize with the anti-type or reality. So he says it is a palpable absurdity that this horn, which came out of the goat, could fight the goat and trample him down; while, if it refers to Rome, he did that very thing. Now if we just take the symbol itself, it would appear as a palpable absurdity, for we know that the horn could not fight the goat; but we do know that the four horns spoken of here in this

connection in Daniel 8 represented the goat kingdom, and we know that one horn did fight the other horn, which we see in the king of the south fighting the king of the north, etc. Now since this is as much of a palpable absurdity, that one horn could fight another horn, as it is that the horn could fight the goat, therefore the argument of M. E. Kellogg is of no force against the S. D. A.'s. So we have to swallow his palpable absurdity if we believe history,, which grows out of the fact of trying to make the type or symbol the same thing as the thing symbolized. To illustrate further the inconsistency of such efforts, we turn to Revelation 5:6-7, where it is said the lamb took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. The skeptic says (reasoning just as these men have reasoned), that it is a palpable absurdity, that the lamb could take a book and open and read it, but the fact is that the thing symbolized by the lamb was the thing that took the book and not the lamb. As you see by this, a man that is somewhat prolific in his imaginations could increase absurdities to an indefinite extent in reference to the application of any and all types. Now consider how confusing is the conception of God's message in those who cease to cooperate.

#### EXHIBIT H. THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE.

Jones No. 1. Now see what he says in Exhibits A to F on the then present standing and condition of the Seventh-day Adventists, and here he gives his convictions very clearly and then see his statements in the "Appeal" leaflet, page 59, which we have already quoted, but will still call your attention to it further:

"As certainly as the Catholic church is a federation, then just so certainly the Seventh-day Adventist church, being only a single church itself, and its own work organized as a single organization, free from all other churches, is likewise a federation."

But you see fourteen years ago there was a place for the Seventh-day Adventist organization, and it was "God's own;" God built it up; and nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of the church could not de-

stroy it; that it was not the papacy and you must not talk so; that the Third Angel's Message at that time was to preach this way, as these Exhibits so far show. But now the Third Angel's Message which is now due to the world is to oppose and expose church federation, which indeed is the Seventh-day Adventist church, who are five years in advance of the great church federation movement; and that "I will preach it." The advance guards get the first shots, and so it has been here at College View.

A question we would like to ask inasmuch as they have a new message, different than it was fourteen years ago, Is it based upon a prophetic period? If so, why do not they tell us? And if so, then the three-fold judgment message in Revelation 14 has been prematurely given to the world, or else this message is about seventy years behind, and hence there will be another movement, just like the past movement, that must go to the ends of the earth.

#### EXHIBIT I. UNITY.

Jones No. 1. "There is a place for the organization." (In another place cited in one of these exhibits), "That present organization and church exactly as it is," or was.

Jones No. 2. "The unity of the spirit in the fellowship of the Father and Son, but not organization unity, nor unity of association,"—"Appeal," page 44.

Not organization unity, for now Jones No. 2 has no place for it; but Jones No. 1 had a place for organization unity. (Exhibit B.)

But fourteen years ago, the unity of the organization as it was, being the subject discussed at that time, exactly as it was built up by God was then needed, and it could "not be destroyed," and "would continue to the end of the world." You will see by the "Bulletin," page 92, that Elder Jones No. 1 recognized the spirit unity at that time, also:—

Jones No. 1. "But God can cause us to see exactly alike. I remember not long ago there were more than a dozen of us met together. Something came before us; and I am perfectly satisfied that there were not three of us who were of the same mind concerning what was before



us; but as we sat there, we compared view with view, and one member suggested one thing, and we said, All right; and another brother suggested something here, and another suggested something else, until the whole company saw the matter exactly as if there were but one. There was no design on the part of those men to see everything exactly alike. The Lord caused more than a dozen people who did not see alike to see exactly alike in a little while."

So you see that Elder Jones, and we all, believed at that time that spirit unity was necessary, notwithstanding that we believed in unity of association and organization, which he now declares is the papacy. But then said, "The then present organization exactly as it is was God's own and he would preserve it." (See Exhibit B.)

You see Elder Jones in all these exhibits believed in the organization as it was and preached it, believing it was one of the fundamentals of the Third Angel's Message, and would be continued even "to the end of the world," because "Christ was in it." What does Elder Jones No. 2 say now? Quoting from one of his recent sermons at College View, he says he believes, especially on organization, the same that he believed twenty years ago, and preached and that he preached this same sermon in 1901, and he also says on page 17 of "Appeal":—

"I say that I hold, fully and truly, without any interpretation or qualifications, every one of these fundamental principles and well defined points of faith, exactly as I always did and exactly as that has been printed in the Seventh-day Adventist "Year Book" of 1907; and that to this day I believe each and every one of these things. And I am not only in perfect harmony with the purpose of preaching the principles of doctrine upon which I entered the Seventh-day Adventist organization, but I am also in perfect harmony with every item that has been officially published as the statement of fundamental principle, or of defined points of faith of Seventh-day Adventists."

Now, I say, is not organization a fundamental principle? It may not have been published in 1907 in the "Year Book" of which he speaks, but it truly is one of

the "well defined points" of our faith which has been published and republished again and again. (See Vol. 1, page 652.)

"I was pointed back to the children of Israel. Very soon after leaving Egypt they were organized and most thoroughly disciplined."—Vol. 1, page 650.

"It is the studied effort" of the enemy "to lead Christians just as far from heaven's arrangement as he can; therefore he deceives even the professed people of God, and makes them believe that order and discipline are enemies to spirituality; that the only safety for them is to let each pursue his own course, and to remain especially distinct from bodies of Christians who are united, and are laboring to establish discipline and harmony of action. All the efforts made to establish order are considered dangerous, a restriction of rightful liberty, and hence are feared as popery. These deceived souls consider it a virtue to boast of their freedom to think and act independently."

So here is a fundamental that he does not believe to-day.

#### EXHIBIT J. WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Jones No. 1: He says something must be done. "Testimony says all of us are at fault. \* \* \* Please begin at the right place. Members of the Conference Committees, please begin on your own committee to correct things; examine your own procedure in dealing with the ministers and carrying on Conference work, and making your audits. \* \* \* Get all these things straight, and you will have enough to do, without watching some other board. \* \* \* Church members \* \* \* please attend to your own church, \* \* \* and the Conference Committee can attend to its part a great deal better."—Page 74, "Bulletin."

In short this means to attend to your own business and the General Conference will attend to theirs.

"What we need is reform in you and I."—Page 63.

"The root of it is that every man must know the Lord."—Page 92.

We see that the organization was all right, but there

needed to be personal experience by the individuals that constituted it. In closing on this section, I must say I do not think Elder Jones wishes to deceive us knowingly and understandingly; but if not, he must be in the dream-land, walking in his sleep, groping his way in the dark. He says he has not changed, preaches the same thing on organization. Rupert sanctions this statement, as he says he has heard him and knows that he preaches the same thing, but all we ask is for you to put against this the testimony of the exhibits, read these exhibits—his statements—and see. If he has changed, he does not know it, and Rupert does not know it.

Now here is a query. Maybe they and their friends can solve it. Both of these men at one time professed to be Seventh-day Adventist preachers. Rupert confesses he has changed, but Rupert and Jones both deny that Jones has changed. Yet these two men came here and joined together to do a work, claiming to be giving the simon pure Third Angel's Message, in which all God's people would eventually unite, by putting aside all their differences and speaking the same thing, and thus come up to the conditions of receiving the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Tell us how these two men united? Was it a heart-to-heart union, or was it a federation? One claimed he believed as he always did, the other that he had changed and gone so far back as to deny the Seventh-day Adventist application of the 2300 days.

Now will you allow men who have departed so far from the light and the truth that they once preached, and which he says he always believed and preached, as Jones No. 2 now preaches, to direct you? If a man can go so far away from his own words that he does not know them; yea, more, and contradicts them, will you trust him to deal out to you the gospel truth and draw conclusions that are unmixed with error? Can he do it? He cannot, if he would.

#### EXHIBIT K. GOING TO PIECES.

Jones No. 1: "You need not be afraid that God's cause is going to pieces."—"Bulletin," page 63. "The

Lord has held this work together for all these years in spite of the fact that this body was no longer His voice, and now we have turned about, and do the best we can, do you think the work is going to pieces?"

Jones No. 2: In a sermon in College View, after reading statistics showing that there was a loss in the United States during one year of about 1,300 members, this was his conclusion from these statistics. He reasoned from these premises and drew this conclusion: That it would all go to pieces, at this same rate, and we could measure up the time.

There was another way for Elder Jones to have gone, in order to arrive at a fair and honest conclusion, but, of course, the Elder had not discovered it, his eyes were holden and he could not see it. That path is through the comparison of the tithe from year to year, instead of the number of members. Now the number of members is a very difficult matter to get at exactly. We can only approximate and I think Elder Jones must know that. I have been president of a Conference for six years where I had to report. So I had to appeal to the authority of the several churches in the conference, and they found that from 25 to 40 per cent of their members had moved away, some of which had not been heard from for years. But they reported them. Even after they had been admonished to clean up their records they still neglected it and so it has gone on from year to year. That has been especially true the last two decades and nothing had more to do with it than Elder A. T.'s influence, who set forth in very strong terms, a very loose and lax church discipline, which many of us older ones very much regretted. Again and again after one of his efforts, I have heard many of the brethren remark, "I will never vote another member out of the church." His position on this special point was about the same as now. But we knew there must be a change, in our loose method of discipline in the churches, as that was not the New Testament order, and it has come and I rejoice in it. Now one thing that operated to bring about this change was the 15-cent-a-week plan per capita. The presidents of our conferences

took some pride in bringing up their conferences to this standard, and about the first thing they did was to look up the records of their churches. They found quite a large number in almost every church or conference that could not be found at all,—some dead, some moved away, some blackslidden, impossible to be found. The trimming off of these dead limbs continued for a period of time in some states where they added 200 or 300 for several years, and yet hardly held their own. The older conferences, especially in the west, seemed to suffer the more, as there were great emigrations to Canada, Mexico, etc. But yet with all this you will see by the increase of the tithe that these were dead branches.

The tithe is a much better index to our activities and church progress. In this there is never more than an occasional irregularity, some large estate left to a church, State or Union, that might lift that particular locality above a normal, but it would soon naturally fall back to normal. As I said, why did he not follow this path up through the tithe from 1908 to 1912 to his conclusion? A much safer, surer, and certain route, with many less irregularities, and would show more certainly whether we were advancing or retrograding. Now that path was right there in plain sight, right before his eyes, in the next column to where his table gives the total number of Sabbath-keepers, there is the Tithe Column, showing an increase, notwithstanding nearly 1300 less Sabbath-keepers, a gain of tithe of \$71,945.90. Now go back one year to 1908 and note the gain to 1912, in tithe;

1909 .....	62,583.61....	gain
1910.....	71,945.90....	gain (the year we suffered the loss)
1911 .....	69,155.86....	gain
1912 .....	\$85,748.68....	gain

Jones No. 2: "Nineteen hundred and ten shows we are about to fall to pieces and become as chaff of the summer's threshing floor, so the wind will carry us away." Now follow your system of calculation introduced and see how often 1200 is contained in (make it even numbers) 60000 members in the U. S. Sixty thousand divided by

1200 equals 50 years. Now we will try Israel in her time by this rule. With the same system of calculation, 23000 fell in one day. (1. Cor. 10:8.) Three million divided by 23,000 equals 130 days. So you see in about 130 days and that movement went to pieces and the wind carried them away and so there is no place found for them.

But that is not the most erratic mistake his reasoning makes. To take any firm, society, corporation, or organization, with several ways or means of embracing their sum of endeavors and activities, with all their results located in all the states and countries of the world, and then take one country with all the results of all their endeavors and make that a basis to determine their progress or success, is the most unreasonable thing, but it is a still greater extreme to take one of these results of those endeavors in one country and make that a basis as in this case before us. Everybody who is not in the dream-land, walking in their sleep, knows the only way is to take all the enterprises with all their results in all the world summed up together and then to draw our conclusion. Now we will take only three of these here in this place on account of room; the others will tally with these.

Increase in all the world:

Sabbath-keepers	Tithe	Per capita
Gain 1912.....5,221	\$176,034.28	\$14.40
Gain 1911.....4,449	138,910.61	13.59
Gain 1910.....3,995	120,446.19	12.81
Gain 1909.....3,352	117,847.49	12.07

Grand totals of all the funds raised by the Seventh-day Adventists for evangelistic work, such as tithes, offerings, etc., for the following years and the gain over each of the preceding years:

1912 .....	\$2,702,199.02
Gain .....	339,110.73
1911 .....	2,363,088.29
Gain .....	239,330.77
1910 .....	2,223,757.52
Gain .....	231,200.37

1909 .....	1,984,557.16
------------	--------------

Gain .....	139,808.08
------------	------------

1908 .....	1,770,649.07
------------	--------------

Gain .....	69,930.95
------------	-----------

(The other table was for U. S. alone. This is all the world.)

I see Elder Jones has ventured to give publicity to his going-to-pieces argument and so has given the readers of the "Gathering Call" the benefit of it. In this he gives an illustration of his conclusion by a team of horses with a load, making the same kind of wonderful progress that he claims Elder Spicer had spoken of. One jumping forward and the other bounding backward farther than the other's leaping forward. Now he wants all these readers to understand that is the kind of progress that the Seventh-day Adventists were making in pulling their load. Now the Seventh-day Adventist denomination which Elder Spicer was talking of as going by leaps and bounds was the **denomination**, not one little church or conference, nor even a union conference, nor even one division, but the whole body taken all together.

But the Elder gives us all to understand that the whole body is going backward. But only cites us to the Central Union Conference as going backward. Then says "it has 185 workers." (But that is not one-twentieth of all our workers) with 9602 Sabbath-keepers (but that is not one-tenth of the whole body). Yet it was the whole body which Elder Spicer was talking about. Now Jones believes if the Central Union Conference goes back the whole world goes back, and further, if the Central Union Conference goes back on just one thing out of many, therefore their whole line of work is going back. Now if their workers could count converts by counting everybody who goes out to hear them I think they could have made a better showing.

The prosperity of a church is known better by the quality of members than the quantity. If fewer members can and will do more and better work than a larger number then they are worth more. To illustrate: A



farmer raises one hundred colts from Mexican ponies, worth ten dollars apiece. Now would it be going backward for that farmer to raise only ten pedigreed colts worth \$500 each, the next year? While that farmer had a lot of other good stock and a good increase from the year before, even his colts though fewer in number, proving to be more valuable, yet in this Elder Jones would see nothing but inefficiency. He says "it is not a very powerful witness to anything but inefficiency"—just like his team of horses. (Also see statistics in a later report.)

I will contrast our standing in the year 1875 with that of 1912—37 years, showing conferences, Sabbath-keepers, schools, periodicals, publishing houses, sanitariums, tithe, and all the contributions, etc., etc. The first column will be for 1875, the second for 1912.

Conferences .....	13	126
Members .....	8,002	114,206
Contributions .....	\$33,155.19	\$2,702,199.02
Tithe .....	32,618.62	1,652,624.44
Laborers .....	140	5,101
Publishing houses .....	3	37
Book sales .....	\$18,000.00	\$1,836,527.00
Sanitariums .....	1	41
Doctors .....	7	129
Employees .....	.....	2,356
Periodicals .....	2	123
Languages .....	2	75
Advanced schools .....	1	90
Teachers .....	13	631
Enrollment .....	289	8,205
Primary schools .....	0	573
Teachers .....	0	631
Enrollment .....	0	15,602

The following contrast shows a gradual movement forward by decades up to 1905, then also during the seven years following.

We had in 1865, the year of the last rebellion, as stated below:

			Per cent of increase
1865.....	4,000.....	Increase	
1875.....	8,000.....	4,000.....	100
1885.....	20,547.....	12,547.....	150
1895.....	47,680.....	27,133.....	125
1905.....	87,311.....	39,631.....	85 about
1912.....	114,206.....	57,995.....	.....

The last figures are for a period of seven years, but counting the rate of increase the same for the next three years, would make for the ten-year period a gain of 82,850, or nearly 95 per cent increase for the ten-year period covering this time of "inefficiency" spoken of by Eld. A. T. Jones. While this shows a gradual increase in membership (of which we do not boast, for we never expected to take in the whole world), a noted statistical authority of the world (this I state from memory), places us as a denomination as standing fourth in per cent of increase for the last decade: Christian Science standing first; Salvation Army, second; Latterday Saints, third. The quality of this membership is shown in one way by the increase of the per capita contributions during the same length of time.

1865.....	\$ 3.00
1875.....	4.13
1885.....	7.36
1895.....	8.55
1905.....	13.52
1912.....	23.66

Are we going back?

I wish I had the statistics of the Snook party to date, to show how they have advanced. In 1875 they were ten years old and claimed from 36 to 40 ministers and 600 members. In 1900 their report shows 19 ministers, 26 churches, and 647 members, one sanitarium, one publishing house, and two periodicals. After 35 years of labor showing a loss of 17 ministers and a gain of 47 members.

I have given some reasons why we might expect the falling off of some members in our old churches. From what I know of the founders of this work they moved in

a most careful way in organizing and taking in members and took the most thorough course in disciplining. I am quite sure before we get back to that standard there will be a lot more of these dead and fruitless branches trimmed off. The Lord will not send an angel to do it for us. The work done in this world is done by the agency of man, and if the church continues to neglect its duty on this point God will take away His hedge about it and let its enemy do their work, and if He is left to do it with his unmerciful hand, he will take off good branches as well as bad, and thus mutilate the tree. This may be the only way the Lord can awaken us to do our work. He has warned us again and again to study the sanctuary question and there is no question that God has spoken more definitely upon and described more clearly—even to the very words the enemy would use, than the question of organization.

The enemy fought hard against organization to start with, for he well knew if he could keep that out part of his victory was already gained. Even the building of the first church was opposed, claiming it would make us just like all other churches—Catholic and all.

One of this quartet referred to said to me while here: "If you will not heed the warning to study the question, and if I can stir you up to do it, I will do some good." "Yes," I replied, "offenses must come, but woe to the man by whom they cometh." (Luke 17:1.)

We are aware that an ingenious man can take words and twist out of them almost anything they want. That is the reason that some people say the Bible is like an old fiddle. You can play any kind of a tune on it. But, my friends, you can't do that unless you put your fingers on the strings. Just keep your fingers off and it will sing the same from morning till night. But figures are somewhat different from words; they just tell the one story; they have but one meaning, and not like words that have many meanings so a man may be honestly deceived. When we come to figures, they speak the same thing to friends and foes,—alike without any variation or shadow of turning; they need no translation, they are the same whether in foreign lands or at home, in sunshine or in

storm, foggy or fair. The fallen foe is more than matched with them, much less a short-sighted man, and the only way left for him to do is to mis-state the problem or draw an arbitrary conclusion, independent from the facts in the case.

We will illustrate further. Take a bank with all its different means of support or advance. I will take its deposits and securities. Somebody says we are going to pieces because our time deposits have fallen off in 1912. Does that follow? Now the bank admits the time deposits have fallen off, but the deposits subject to check have increased a good deal more than the time deposits have lost, upon which interest is paid. Suppose our personal securities have fallen off, but our real estate mortgages have increased more than the other has fallen off, would you say, could you say, that we were going to pieces? You see a steady increase.

Now, could any fair-minded man say and actually believe that the bank was failing because of this? It would seem even if he was a bitter enemy that for his self-respect as an intelligent man he would not dare to say it; but if he did, we would conclude that he was under the influence of some kind of intoxicants and so delirious he was groping his way in the dark, having passed the line of consciousness some way or some how.

Now, Brother Jones No. 2 has something to say about the number of workers. "To gain about 4,000 additions it took about 4,000 workers, so that makes one to a worker." But about half are canvassers, and the last two years we have had about 1,350 missionary licenses, and these are such as our teachers in our schools, doctors in all our sanitarium work, also workers in the publishing houses, Bible workers, and nurses, mostly girls, receive. Now we are left with only about 800 ministers. We have two, three, and four in every one of our large schools; at least one in every sanitarium. This does not leave a great many in the field, and all these institutions are there helping others to get ready to go out into the wide harvest field. The last year or two our young people have been going out by the score, as the result of that

“machinery” of which he talks so much about.

Our membership was 73,000 at the opening of 1903; it was 114,000 when 1913 opened, which is an increase of 41,000 believers and helpers in the proclamation of this message. This really means an increase of many more than forty-one thousand, after deducting the losses by death, and of others drifting back to the world.

Ten years ago the total sum raised for the work was \$842,000; in 1912 the amount was over three times that at the opening of the decade, or \$2,702,000.

In 1903, \$102,000 was contributed to foreign missions; in 1912 the contributions were \$362,000, or more than three times the amount given ten years before. In 1903 the Sabbath-schools gave \$34,000 to missions, and this was considered by us all a great growth; in 1912 the gifts were \$232,000. For 1913 the totals went far beyond a quarter of a million dollars from the Sabbath schools. As another has said:

“The past ten years, turn where we may, are bright with evidences of the leading of our heavenly Master. Where ten years ago beginnings were just being made, as in China, now thousands are bearing the banner of the cross, with the message going rapidly into new communities.”

God’s power is leading His people. We see it not only in statistical reports, but in the earnest buckling on of the spiritual armor for the last service in this precious cause. By consecrated service, under the Spirit’s power, the results have come. Yet ten years ago some who were separating from the organized movement and standing in an attitude of opposition, were declaring that the movement was going to pieces. Far from it!

Let us have the chorus:

“That I am right and have been right, I know  
Because my own convictions tell me so.  
I reverence the good, old Book, you see,  
If translated and then explained by me.  
By churchly laws and customs I abide  
If they in my opinions coincide.

To be right is simply this to say:

That I will oppose and expose S. D. A.'s."

How could I sit still, do you suppose, with all these inconsistencies flying in the air over my head and buzzing in my ears while these men were daring me, challenging me, to open my mouth in self-defense? Well, it taxed all my Christian forbearance to the limit that I have been able to cultivate or accumulate for the last fifty years. So I soliloquized thus: "Now, old man, you had better keep still; hold your peace. Go no further than to ask questions. You know it is neither good sense nor good Bible religion to deliberately walk into a controversy of this kind. You know that it is not a favorable opportunity to get truth into the human heart; you know this by your own experience and the divine word. You see by your questions that a large share of their congregation is very much displeased, wrought up to a white heat, to even allow questions. Better wait till you all get cooled off, when you each may have a good second thought and time to weigh all your words and know of a surety that they will stand the crucial test. Then let them fall with their full weight upon the hideous forms of error with no other aim nor object than to help some poor soul who is hunting for the unmixed word. They will not stop until they have found it, if they are really seeking it, and it is better for that class to get a clear view of what is being said by these men and then in due time they will be able to get a clear and clean view of the subject of controversy, knowing truth will line up with every other truth."

I was once lost, and at that time I remembered, having been in the same condition once before, that a lost man generally wants to go the wrong way, so I decided to turn about and go the other way, even though it seemed to me that I was then going away from home. I soon came in sight of our own house, but I did not know it. It was on the wrong side of the hill; it was turned around and did not appear natural. It took quite an effort to convince myself that that was our house, but by making an effort, closing and opening my eyes several times, so

that I might be able to take a different viewpoint, at last it appeared natural and right.

At one time I got on here at Lincoln to go east. A lady got on also and sat her grip down at the other end of the car, then she went out and came back and sat down near me. When she got to Omaha she began to look for her grip; got the brakeman and her friend that met her at this place and others on the car looking for it. So at last I asked her what she was looking for. She told me, so I said, "Lady, you set that grip down at the other end of the car." "No,"—she was very positive—she said, "I set it down right here." I said, "Lady, you came in at the other end of the car and set your grip down, then you went out and you came back in and came to this end of the car." So I got up and went to the other end of the car; I saw a grip setting on a seat, nobody sat there, and I asked the men who were sitting by, one by one, if that was their grip. "No," "No," "No," was the answer. "Lady, this is yours." "No," she said, "it does not look anything like mine." I said, "Lady, open it and see. Do you remember what you had at the top of your grip?" So she looked and found her own garments in it, but the grip did not look like hers. "Well," I said, "the grip was not lost, you were lost."

Now, I wonder if Elder Jones No. 2 is not in about that same condition. I wonder if he knows his own words; if he will remember what we have quoted from the "Bulletin" as his own words,—this is a stenographic report of his words, convictions and belief as entertained in regard to all these subjects at that time, to which I have called your attention, which we then termed a part of the Third Angel's Message which he was preaching. And now what is the Third Angel's Message at the present time with him?

Now, Elder Jones continues to pile up his views, night after night, preaching his Third Angel's Message, which is to oppose and expose federation, and the S. D. A. is a federation of the first water; so his cry is, "Federation, federation. Come out of her, my people, etc." It is reported by one of his adherents that Jones and Rupert

came to show up our inconsistencies. They are working hard to do it; yet they have the effrontery to ask the privilege of coming into our church in order to do this work. In any civil government there is no crime so deep or heinous, extremely wicked and flagrant as treason. A man may violate the law, steal, etc.; he is only a thief, a law-breaker; while a traitor not only disregards the law but seeks to overthrow the government, to tear it down and destroy it. His moral standing might be above reproach, but that would not lessen the depth of the crime. Well, would they keep him in their bosom, invite such a one into their palaces, into their government buildings to do his work; or would they expel him?

There is no relationship so sacred, so tenderly near the Lord, as church relationship. Family relationship is very dear, but now take a husband,—a father who is becoming restless and dissatisfied with his family life. In the course of events he begins to drop some hints to those visiting his family that he has not been and is not treated with the respect that the great dignity of his position and standing demands. As time goes on he grows worse and more alienated until he talks much with every one with whom he comes in contact of his feelings. So everybody knows how he feels. He grows so far away that when he speaks of his own family, he speaks of them as “they.” “They” did so; “they” so, “they” this and “they” that. They cease to be his family in truth; so everybody can see he is really alienated and separated, heart and soul. He keeps on until his faithful wife can endure it no longer. so she at last resorts to the court to relieve this situation, and it gives her a letter separating them so that she will not be compelled to be embarrassed by the husband and father any longer. So he retires and for a time she does not see him, but after a few years he returns to her own town. She has been laboring and toiling, early and late, to keep her little family together and in as respectable a condition as possible. He still runs in the same old channel, greatly magnifying all her faults. Now he has the cheek to come to her own home town to pour out his invectives; it being



well known and understood by his friends, and even some of them reported, that he is to show up her failures and faults and inconsistencies to the world. Yea more, he even comes to her and asks her to furnish him a house to do this work in; or allow him to use her own house. Now what should she tell him? What is her Christian duty? Can she take him in? Will any sensible person be puzzled to know how to answer this question? Even his friends ought to know; if they do not, it is because they have lost all regard for good sense and this abused and toiling mother. Yet in the face of all these facts he can go out and gather to himself the little gifts and donations and her honest earnings, for which she has labored and toiled for years, talking even disparagingly to some of her children of her peculiarities and inconsistencies. No man, unless he is lost in the dreamland of inconsistencies, so much so that he would not know himself if he should happen to see himself in a glass, would not know his own words, for he is all turned around, going the wrong way, but does not realize it, like the Indian: "Indian no lost, wigwam lost."

Now I wonder if these exhibits to which I have called his attention, statements that were made by Elder Jones, will not look very strange to him when he looks them over. Will he know them? Does he now know when he is preaching here that he made these statements?

In closing on these exhibits, I would say again that I do not think that Elder Jones wishes to deceive us knowingly and understandingly; but if not, he must be in a dream. Has he changed?

Elder Rupert has gone so far away and gone on so long in opposition to the Message that he can with a measure of imagined gallantry attempt to scale the walls of the citadel of our strongholds and make the last effort of his life to plant his banner—their new Third Angel's Message—upon this the so-called ruins, (as they claim we are going to pieces) of the Third Angel's Message, and hurl his missiles at the sanctuary at a furious rate. He finds to his own satisfaction that the 2300 days ends with the end of the world, and that is 1995. Then to

find the beginning of the 2300 days, he says just count back 2300 which will bring you to 301 B. C. So you see he lands upon the sandbars and rocks of a "definite time" theory. You will see, if acquainted with the plain, clear message of God, that his whole route or pathway is thickly set and lined with these rocky difficulties all the way up to his conclusion. He takes his position that the 19th verse is an interpretation of the 2300 days and the end of all things, so of course the end of the world is the end of the 2300 days. He determines the coming of Christ by the types to a definite time, and so he figures out the time which God has reserved to Himself. Matt. 24:36. Angels cannot figure it out. It is not for us to know. Acts 1:7. We can know when it is nigh at hand (verse 33), but He has left the exact time indefinite. If this is not so, let Rupert tell us why the Lord gave us twelve long chains of prophecy covering the entire gospel history, and yet leaving definite time out in every one of them and even the seven of them found in the New Testament which describes very fully the warning message which is to prepare a people for His coming, leaves it indefinite as to the exact time; yea more, some of them warn us against it. If my position stated above was not true, you would not find these men hard pressed as they are to find evidence, and would refer again and again to it, even if they had only one of the dozen chains of prophecy. You would find their hearers familiar with this prophecy. I doubt if one of their followers can follow them in their windings. I believe it is more or less a mystery to at least the most of them. I see by talking with them that but little stress is placed on the prophecies. I would have more hope of convincing them of their error if they **did** have a clear view of their position. I want these believers to tell me why this silence on the part of God for the 1500 years that the Bible was being written and at least twelve definite opportunities given in the prophecies alone for making this view prominent. This silence is inexcusable if these men are right.

Now let us look at Elder Rupert's fix-up on Daniel 8. Well, he says the 19th verse is an explanation of the question and answer in the 13th and 14th verses, and says this one given in chapter 9 has nothing at all to do with it. This vision belongs to the time of the end, and the time of the end Rupert believes commences in 1798, the same as we do; but he says the "indignation" spoken of here is the same as the seven last plagues in Revelation. Notice first that Gabriel was commanded to make Daniel understand the vision. Now when Gabriel goes to the 19th verse he commences with an assurance that he will show Daniel something in this vision, as he had been commanded in verse 16 to make Daniel understand. So the "indignation" is something brought to view in this vision; not something outside of this vision but something spoken of in some way or other by some symbol or literal statement right here, for Gabriel would not deviate from this divine order. - Rupert turned to Jeremiah, Isaiah and Revelation to find an "indignation" period. Now if there was only one period of that kind, then this course would be admissible, but if two or more there would be no certainty about it until they were identified. Paul in Romans 2:8, 9, shows indignation and wrath brings tribulation and anguish, so we see where there is tribulation, etc., there is indignation of some kind. Now we are ready to look for indignation or tribulation periods in the prophetic word of God and see what we can find. Rupert applied Daniel 12:1 to this indignation in the seven last plagues, and tried to identify it with Daniel 8:19, but we see that Daniel 8:19 is identified with Matt. 24:21. In Daniel 12 God's people are all delivered, but in Matt. 24 God's people suffer this tribulation, the result of the indignation of this Roman power.

Now we will look into this vision to see if we can discover any of this indignation of this power. See verse 10. "And cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." Verse 11. "Yea, he magnified himself to the prince of the host \* \* \* took away the daily sacrifice and the place of His [Christ's] sanctuary was cast down." (Heb. 8 tells

us that Christ's sanctuary is the one that the Lord pitched and not man.) So we find an indignation period right here in this vision the same as in Dan. 7:25, also here in Dan. 8:24, where Gabriel is giving an interpretation of this vision.

We will turn to the 11th chapter of Daniel and here nearly all Protestant commentators agree that this vision is simply a running commentary on the 8th chapter with the symbols eliminated. You see it commences with the Persian kings then in the 3rd verse comes to the divided state of Grecia, then on a detailed account or straight narrative between two of these four kings,—the north, Syria; the south, Egypt, and the other two were swallowed up by these; and then it follows them in their maneuvers till we strike Rome just the same as in the 2nd, 7th and 8th chapters of Daniel. And so if this is a literal description from the Persian kingdom down to the end of the world (Dan. 12:1) then we will expect this description to pass over Rome—the same ground as the 8th chapter—and hence we will see these facts brought out with the symbols all eliminated. It looked like Rome was brought out in verse 14, "The robbers of the people," also verse 16, "He shall stand in the glorious land which by his hand shall be consumed." This was all true of Rome, but the Protestant commentators from the Newtons down to Clark, etc., agree that Rome comes in full blast before we get to verse 31. What do we find facing us right here? The same thing we had held up to us in the 8th chapter about which Daniel was so much concerned. That is the polluting of the sanctuary of strength, the one the Lord pitched and not man. (See Heb. 8:2, also "not made by hands," 9:24.) The sanctuary above, and shall take away the daily service in the temple above, —interferes, interrupts, substitutes something false, a counterfeit instead of the true service. As says 2 Thess. 2:4: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." So by his substitutes he takes away the true service and he himself stands there as the substitute of Christ, and

boasts of his authority—Lord God the Pope, the vicegerent of the Son of God.

Where are we in the history of the world? Are we back before Christ came the first time, where M. E. Kellogg applies it? Nay, verily, and we will see more clearly when we come to what fellows closely on the heels of this indignation, etc. Is this at the close of time, at the end of the world, where Rupert applies it? No. You see this was all done by Rome when she was seen in the temple of God, not after the close of probation, but after the way into the most holy was made manifest, but not after Christ's work was done and the censer cast to the earth. Just look at this tribulation such as never was, Matt. 24, or as stated here, "They shall fall by the sword, by flame, by captivity, and by spoil many days." This was at least 1260 days, the same as chapter 7, and that would bring you to the time of the end, 1798. This you see is the indignation or tribulation of those days, and also of the 8th chapter, and 19th verse. Why doesn't it say so? It does, in verse 36, "Shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished." Something going on at this time when many are falling, and will go on till that is complete, at which time this power received a deadly wound and this indignant power gradually lost its grip. "They shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end." Dan. 7:26. The wilderness state of the church seems to be at an end. This sackcloth state of humiliation, tribulation and anguish ended the 1260 days as spoken of in Rev. 10:2, 3, and in 12:6. Then she is seen marching up out of the wilderness, leaning on the arm of her beloved, Cant. 8:5, coming into possession of the clearer light, especially of the prophetic word.

There can be no mistake here about the indignation, Dan. 8:19. Some apply it to that suffered by the wicked under the plagues, but we see clearly it applies to God's people. See Dan. 11:31. This power, Rome, was to have indignation against the holy covenant. The relation that the church maintained with God did not please Rome, and so there commenced a relentless persecution, which

was kept up for these 1260 long years to the time of the end, and then it began to weaken because of the rise of the Reformation. With this indignation in her heart against the people, she would corrupt and change every right way and so pollute the sanctuary and substitute her own sacrifices and services in its stead, as the Pope was the vicar of God and not subject to any earthly tribunal. This increased light and knowledge of the Bible, growing out of its increased circulation and out of the intellectual awakening shown with great clearness, as a light in a dark place, more and more till we come to the third and last message, which lifts the curtain and gives us a view of the sanctuary and its cleansing and the ministry of our great High Priest and His position and service. The 12th chapter and 11th verse locates this quite clearly, showing definitely that Kellogg is wrong in locating it before Christ, for it is done not by Grecia but Rome, and during those prophetic days, 1290, which commenced about the year 503 or 508 when this Roman council voted that the Pope was to be the vicar of God, and closes about 1798, where the time of the end commences. This is also shown by the 11th chapter and 33rd-35th verses, which is the last end of the indignation, but not at the last end of the time of the end where Rupert applies it, which would be at the end of the world and at the time of the indignation upon the wicked. There was no earthly sanctuary to pollute, and he does not believe it applies to the heavenly,—no daily sacrifice to be taken away and no sanctuary to be cleansed—positions contrary and incompatible with the whole tenor of nearly all these long chains of prophecy.

Let us look again at that 19th verse: "The last end of the indignation, for at the time appointed the end shall be." What end? What is he talking about, the indignation period? What is appointed? Indignation period. End of what, this period? But Rupert says this end is the end of the world, which is the end of the 2300 days, which constitutes this appointment, and then added in his talk with me his old phrase, Daniel "positively locates" the end of the 2300 days at this point, viz., end

of the world. So you see, according to his positive interpretation God has appointed the time when the world is to end.

Mark this position right in the face of the fact that none of the heavenly family knows anything about this appointment. See Mark 13:32. He not only says no man knows the day or hour, but states it still broader, "for ye know not when the time is," v. 33. You may know the generation, you may know it is near, Matt. 24:33, 34, but you do not know the time, the year. God has reserved this point to Himself (Acts 1:7), but has told us enough about it so we need not be in the dark, but know it is near, and tells us to watch, for it is not eighty-one years ahead, for that would nullify God's command to **watch**. I want to illustrate that:

"Ye know not the time." But "when you see all these things know it is near, even at the doors." "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Christ's coming is one of them. When they "begin to come to pass" we know our "redemption draweth nigh." This leaves the exact time indefinite. I am put on the **watch** by having my attention called to these signs and so I begin to watch, but this Message must go to the world so all of God's people will be put on the watch, as all must be keeping that command to watch when He comes. But the minute you make it definite you cease to watch.

I do not watch for an incoming train before its scheduled time, nor for anything else before its time. We do not watch for vegetation to spring up in the winter. I go to the depot at the scheduled time. If the train does not come then, I just begin to watch, for now I do not know what minute it might come. But if the news comes that the train is ten hours late and so heavy-loaded it can not make up any time, that still leaves her arrival quite definite, so I cease to watch for ten hours, and that definite statement is the cause of it. Hence, God has not nullified His own command to watch by giving us definite time.

Now look at it. **This generation.** When did it com-

mence? You can not locate it positively to a certain year. How long is it? The Lord does not definitely give that. Hence He leaves us waiting and watching, for "we know not the time."

Rupert gives us a little pamphlet called "Concerning the End of the World," in which on pages 1-17 he runs through Lev. 23:24, 25, and shows to his own satisfaction what these types all mean. Then he calls up the old tradition (p. 17) that the world was to stand 6,000 years, so out of these types and this old tradition and some of the prophetic periods, he makes three chains of prophecy (I do not know any other name to call it), and interprets them showing they all land us at the same place, viz., at the end of the world. Elder Jones listens with profound interest and assents to them, so he gives them the weight of his influence.

On page 16 Rupert says, "We hold that these feasts represent the history of the world for 7,000 years, viz., 6,000 when complete will mark the coming of Christ." Then he takes a journey through the chronological world and lands at the end of the 6,000 years in the year A. D. 1995, then, second, he applies these typical feasts all the way down to the close of probation and on over the 7,000 years and fits into the 1260-day period (which brings us to 1798). And what he calls the time of the end of the antediluvian world was 120 years which, added to 1798, the beginning of our time of the end, brings us to 1918 (pp. 33, 34), where he says probation closes. Then he says the next prophetic period is 30 years (Zech. 11:8), which he adds, bringing us to 1948, quoting Hosea 5:7; Rev. 17:1-5, 18; Isa. 32:10. Then he says following this comes the feast of tabernacles for 40 years, the time Israel was in the wilderness, added to 1948, brings us to 1988 (Micah. 7:14, 15). Now you see this lacks seven of bringing us to the end of the world. Then, after ransacking the Bible, he finds the seven years in Ezek. 32:2-10, and adds it, which fills it all out up to the end of the world, 1995, with scrupulous exactness. He has the first two lines of his prophecy brought out here in his pamphlet. Now if he can fix up a third one he will have a threefold



cord which the wise man says "is not quickly broken," so here at College View or some time after 1910, when his pamphlet was written, he fixed up another chain out of the 2300 days by saying that they commenced in 301 B. C. and hence must close 1995. Then he said that he was not as much interested in the beginning of these days as the S. D. A. people were, but was interested in their close. I suppose that was the reason he gave no proof that they began in 301 B. C. But we will see hereafter that he had made a very different application in 1910 of the 2300 days. So now he has his three lines of prophecy all landing us at the same place, 1995—the end of the world. Shall I call this a wonderful coincidence? Elder, why not? Instead of all this, just say, for the sake of the argument, that this first line everybody believes, the second is self-evident, and the third is true without doubt. Now I suppose he feels like another one of this quartette said, that it is all brought within the pale of certainty, so that there is not one chance in a million to be wrong.

Now, these become a part of this new Third Angel's Message—we have church federation and these three chains of prophecy and the changes set forth by Ballenger in regard to Christ's work in the sanctuary, some changes on the mark of the beast, and organization, constituting the message. As one of these chains show that probation closes in 1918, they are looking now for the great outpouring of the Spirit upon this message, so they will have their divine credentials to go to the world to do their work. I do not know whether they expect to put away their differences and come into one accord, or whether they expect to go just as they are going. We see the time would appear to us, looking at it from our standpoint and the progress they have made the last three years, a little short to do this great work; at least it takes great faith to believe that this work will be done in four years. If they believe it, I would have to exclaim, "Great is thy faith!"

Rupert's tract referred to "Concerning the End of the World," written in 1910, p. 34, says in regard to the 2300 days, Daniel 8:14: "The time when this period be-

gins is **positively** stated in Dan. 9:25, B. C. 457." Then on page 8, speaking on the day of atonement, says "it met its antitype in the judgment which began in heaven in 1844." Then on page 45, speaking of the Ottoman empire, it says, "Many students of prophecy were anxiously anticipating this event which established the 2300 years to reach to the hour of God's judgment, Oct. 22, 1844." Now mark, after declaring the end of the 2300 years was established by another prophecy, Rev. 9:15, and also after declaring the beginning of the 2300 days was **positively** stated by Dan. 9:25, he comes here to College View, December, 1913, and preaches to the people that the 2300 days commenced in B. C. 301 and closes 1995 A. D. He not only goes back on the S. D. A. denomination, but goes back on John the Revelator, the beloved disciple of the Lord (Rev. 9:15), and goes back on Daniel's **positive** statement that the 2300 days began 457 B. C. (Dan. 9:25). And he is now sure he is right, and of course just as sure as he is right, just so sure Daniel and John were wrong. And Jones No. 2 is just as sure that he is right now as Rupert is, even though it should prove Jones No. 1 wrong.

Elder Rupert said to me, since the above lines were written, in speaking about his change of belief on the 2300 days, that he was proud of it that he had changed. Just see what that involves. He had said that "the time when this period begins is positively stated in Dan. 9:25, which was B. C. 457." If Daniel positively said that, then does he not say the same today, and if he says the same now, how can Rupert be proud of his change while insisting that Daniel positively says now that it closes in the end of the world, 1995, and hence dates back 2300 for their beginning, viz., B. C. 301? Was Daniel mistaken, or is it Rupert, who is proud he has and can change?

Well, we can afford to have such go back on us as long as we can be left in the company of John and Daniel.

Now contrast this crooked and unnatural application to the Third Angel's Message's application. See the last verse. After explaining three of the four points of Daniel 8, namely, the ram, goat and little horn, the fourth point he calls the vision of the evening and morning (verse 14,

chapter 8, margin). Then he says in the 26th verse that none understood the vision of the evening and morning. Now you see the unmistakable connection in chapters 8 and 9. Chapter 9, verses 21 and 22, refer to this very vision in Daniel 8 which he did not understand, and which Gabriel had been commanded to make him understand. Dan. 8:16. Then here he says, "I am come for to give you \* \* \* understanding." Verse 22. He also says, "Understand the matter and consider the vision." Verse 23. What vision? The one he did not understand; the vision of the evening and morning? Now consider it, what vision of the evening and morning. Listen to Gabriel: Seventy weeks are cut off. Cut off of what? They must be cut off from something in the vision and for a certain purpose; but 70 weeks is a measure of time, and if there is any measure of time in the vision then this measure of time must belong in some way to that measure of time, in the vision as it is an explanation of that measure of time, just as sure as Gabriel was not a fallen angel but came to Daniel fulfilling the command given him in Dan. 8:16, "Make this man understand the vision." So we say it is proper to use that word "determined," "cut off," notwithstanding the ridicule and diversion that one of these speakers tried to bring upon this idea for the use of this word. Now please drop down just three verses below this one, 26th verse. See "determined" (over which he tried to excite some amusement and laughter). Now look at the margin where it is translated "cut off." These seventy weeks are cut off of the 2300 days, then the beginning of the seventy weeks is the beginning of the 2300 days, and that is definitely located by verse 25 at the time of the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, which is easily located in the year 457 B. C., with a half a year already passed, in which it went forth, which would leave just  $456\frac{1}{2}$  full years before Christ. Then take  $456\frac{1}{2}$  from 2300. This leaves you  $1843\frac{1}{2}$  years this side of Christ. This  $1843\frac{1}{2}$  are full years, and this would include the first day of the first year and the last day of the last year, which would land you one-half of a year

over into 1844. That is where the sanctuary was to be cleansed or the judgment day in Israel to open, and hence the judgment message of Rev. 14:6 to be given.

Now run it over in your mind as we have in this epistle, and see what marvelous coincidence there is of so many of these prophetic words. Truly, it is a great center around which the prophets and apostles revolved with rapture and delight. My brethren, we have held on too long; there are too many things held to this center by the mighty power of God, moving in harmony with the great spirit, for us to fly off on a tangent after some delusive light, which must after a short race of triumph lead its victims into the bogs and swamps and then go out in everlasting darkness.

Still Rupert and Jones believe that they are in the line where the Spirit of the Lord, like on the day of Pentecost, will work mightily for them. They have been at this work for eight years or upwards, and we see how nearly they are of one accord; even though a quartet of them are here, not one believes the same as another, if they unite together it is evidently with one object in view, they unite together it is evidently with one object in view, and that is to show the inconsistencies of the S. D. A. church. One believes the little horn of Daniel 8 refers to Rome, and, from the best light that I could get, from this one in his talks the 2300 days ended and judgment began in 1844. Ballenger believes the same on that point, but the judgment or atonement day commenced when Christ ascended on high. Rupert believes the little horn of Daniel 8 refers to Rome, but believes the 2300 days commenced in 301 before Christ and closes in 1995, and that the sanctuary spoken of here has no reference to the heavenly sanctuary. While Kellogg, the other man in the quartet, believes the 2300 days to be 2200, and that to be 2200 sacrifices, one in the morning and one in the evening. Hence only 1100 days, and they were all fulfilled in the profaning of the Jewish temple by Antiochus. Jones, Ballenger, and Rupert believe alike in one thing—that the S. D. A. church is not organized according to the due order of God, but is modeled after the papacy

and is the papacy, and any church organized thus makes them the papacy, and so they cannot help but do the work of the papacy, and that no man is honest enough, nor is he good enough, to officiate in that organization in the capacity of president, etc., elected as they are, without coming between God and the people, the same as the Pope.

They claim to have the truth on organization, and the Holy Ghost is the organizer, and they very properly go back to the Pentecostal day. So let us examine the results of their Holy Ghost organization, and what do we find: One believing one thing, and one another, but no two alike only in sounding the chorus against our organization. After several years of work on this line at this same rate of progress, how long will it be until they all see alike, and when they are joined together in all things, like the believers on the day of Pentecost, shall we see thousands added to their numbers and the message going to all the ends of the earth? We see no sign of it yet.

I would call your attention carefully to these exhibits, Jones No. 1, and you will see that these statements are so explicit and clear that they leave no room for argument. They call for no course of reasoning from which to draw conclusions; they make plain, positive assertions which are clear and very explicit; and if they mean what they say, they declare that the church organization or conference and all of the organized work is all right, "Built up by God," and the great need is not a change in the church organization but personal experience of all its members, and particularly the General Conference Committee, and "if every individual gets right himself with God, all things else are right in the organization," General Conference, et cetera.

You will notice the statements made are quoted nearly all from the written record, a very few given from memory. As we have said, there is but little room to reason upon these statements; they need none. What shall we decide? Does it not follow that if the organization was right when Jones was in it, and now wrong

because he is out of it; if the church was not the papacy when he was in it, and now the papacy when he is out of it; the organization built up by God when he was in it, and modeled after the papacy when he is out of it, shall we not say simply that where Jones is it is all right and where he is not it is all wrong; that where he is the papacy cannot dwell and where the papacy is there is no Jones; where Jones No. 2 is there is no federation, where federation dwells there is no Jones No. 2; where Jones is there is no model of organization like poor old Moses's, and where Moses is, no Jones, for they cannot dwell together; and where Jones is, there you will find the New Testament order, and where he is not, even though he has been, the New Testament order is absent also? Shall we not be encouraged with the presence of such a one here at College View?

Is there any man such an expert in logic or such a sleight-of-hand performer in reasoning that he can, right before your eyes and ears, right out in the open, without any screen, canvass or cover, make the leap from Jones No. 1 to Jones No. 2 on organization, saying without any variation or prevarication, open and above board, that he occupied the same position and preaches the same thing on organization as he did then, 1899? More, can he say and make you believe that he "believed this same thing exactly as he now preaches, twenty years ago?" "Preached this same sermon at General Conference 1901 that I preached here tonight." (College View, Dec., 1913.) The words which I quoted in Exhibit A. Now if a man can make that leap at one plunge, so adroitly, so scientifically that his hearers cannot see that he has changed but that this is the same old Third Angel's Message that he set forth fourteen years ago; while he himself and Rupert say it is the same, and he believes it so strongly that he is asking some one of us men to show him if it is not the same, or to show him wherein he differs from the true order of things, the fundamentals of the S. D. A., it will be astonishing! Can you allow him to deal out to you from the sacred Word the truth with any degree of certainty or assurance

that he will not wobble over the line to the wrong side, consciously or unconsciously? While he has shown himself capable of spanning that space which is measured by a distance equal to the east from the west (from Jones No. 1 to Jones No. 2) by following the mysterious windings of his own peculiar logic, so the casual observer would not discover any irregularity, would not discover any great distance of his conclusions from his premises. I ask, Can you trust him to lead you? I confess that this effort excels all others with which I ever have been brought in contact, and I have had some experience for nearly fifty years in following men closely to see whether they would jump a cog in their logic, or keep in line with themselves and the truth. I think in a short time he will be willing to own up like Rupert that he has changed, for he will go back on the 2300 days, the sanctuary question, the foundation of the Third Angel's Message. Then it will be useless to ask anyone to show him wherein he differs from himself in the past in preaching or from the message, for everybody will then know it. Will his adherents then follow him as a leader? Will they not know and understand his attitude? Then what will be their excuse? They who believe this message of God will go no further. They will see it is without a prophetic foundation; yea more, without any, and their message, like a vessel upon the mighty deep without chart or compass in the midst of the fogs and darkness of a boundless ocean.

In fact, I heard after the above lines were written, that Elder Jones had indorsed Rupert's position on the 2300 days. Elder Rupert told me himself that the Elder had lined up with him on the 2300 days. I have been looking for this. All right, we will see. They claim that they are going to the world the same way we have been going. But our discourses were constructive, not merely denying error but proclaiming a great system of truth, repudiating the false, of course, when we were assailed, and so tried hard to follow the Master, simply by bearing witness to the truth. They have assailed the church night after night with every argument that a skill-

ful controversialist could use, and there is an impression all over this community that it is about time that we should speak, not simply with the spirit of antagonism but as free from this as possible, and especially free from bitter feeling.

You will see by what we have quoted from the records of that South Lancaster Conference that we had a special meeting in which we sought the Lord, and Elder Jones took the lead. These statements of Elder Jones No. 1, set forth in these exhibits, were inspired by the spirit of that meeting. They came from the honest convictions of his soul; they fell spontaneously from his lips, issued from the depths of his heart, set forth in the most specific manner with no questionable meaning. They seemed like arrows not prepared by his own hand, and came with force with no indefinite aim and piercing the mark at every venture. But where is he now? We have not attempted to follow these men in all their aerial flights so far beyond all logical reason and common philosophy, through the mists of the most mysterious windings and intricate mazes of their own imaginations. But we have referred to just a few of their more common and oft repeated strictures. Surely these things should remind him that he occupied a different position upon the question of organization and the Third Angel's Message at that time.

I want to call your attention to a further consideration of these people who go out from us, both as to their spirit and attitude toward us. I call it rebellion because they commence to tear us down (I mean what we call and have been calling for over fifty years, the Third Angel's Message), and tear down what they have helped to build up, and are delighted to see our churches go to pieces and come out from what they call Babylon and come to them, and no one can deny but what that is rebellion against **our** cause, whether our cause is right or wrong, and hence we have a right to call it rebellion and place it in the same category with all rebellions that are set forth in the Scriptures and otherwise. It is a duty instead of an unkindness, and so considered in every government,



association, or society, to give such things the right name and so protect the loyal subjects from imposition that might be practiced upon them.

Of course they do not like the name and feel that it is unkind to be classed as such, for they know that it will hurt their influence with the loyal subjects, so they feel you are harsh and you have injured them, yet there is no more surer proof of rebellion than for a man to complain of unkindness, because this word rebellion is used under these circumstances, for he knows he is disloyal to the cause that he is criticising and his work and words prove it every day, and, in fact, he often confesses with an air of triumph that he has got free from the **man-made machinery, etc.**

Now I want to place here, side by side, statements made by our men and some by them, some of which have appeared in the "Gathering Call" and also in the "Review." First, notice they do not hesitate to say we have abandoned the Christian Order, that we are the papacy, and we are far in advance of the sweeping movement of church federation, and we are Babylon itself. They are the reformers, and have taken the position to themselves that they are giving a call to S. D. A.'s and others to "come out of her, my people."

Look here at our brethren. Their relationship to this work, their words and the spirit they manifest, remembering that anything like rebellion would have a tendency to agitate the mind like Moses was agitated when he threw down the tables of stone and broke them at the presentation of the work of that meek and quiet brother of his, Aaron. Now they pose as reformers among us to get us right with God and so breathe the influence of the good spirit upon us, and so give the Third Angel's Message the right ring, to open our eyes that we may be able to see the divine marks of handwriting of God in their work.

Now take every statement and put them side by side. I will underscore a few of them and make a few observations.

## Extracts from "The Gathering Call"

Denver, Colorado  
April 27, 1914.

Mr. Lee Eylar, Editor.  
Bache, Okla.

Dear Sir and Brother: The issue of your paper under date of April 14, with supplement enclosed is before me. I noticed quite a lengthy report from Charles S. Stones under the heading "An Experience."

In this article Mr. Stones gives what purports to be a report of a meeting held with the Central Seventh-day Adventist church in St. Louis, Missouri, beginning September 18. As some of the statements in this report and more particularly, some omissions are misleading, **I beg the opportunity to supplement** Mr. Stone's report by correcting one or two statements, and supplying one or two important omissions of items which doubtless escaped his memory while writing his report.

In the second paragraph in reporting the meetings held Friday night and Sabbath morning Mr. Stones says: "Leading the members of the Central church—about 126—to believe that there was going to be some interest taken in the work, etc." This would lead the reader to suppose that there were present "about one hundred twenty-six" members. I have to write entirely from memory on this point, but as far as my **memory serves me**, I would suppose that there were possibly fifty present at the meeting.

In paragraph 3 the statement is made, speaking of the business meeting the evening after the Sabbath, "The first thing they did was to notify the people that their church had been 'disbanded' the day previous." Mr. **Stones doubtless forgot to state the fact** that the church in that very meeting voted to accept the recommendation made by the Conference Committee the day previous to disband the church and reorganize. He doubtless forgot to mention the fact that twenty-nine members voted in favor of the recommendation of the Conference Committee, and eight voted against it.

In paragraph 6 Mr. Stones says, "Elder Robinson

stated that the Committee had chosen a few names for a nucleus to start with." **I am certain that every member of the Committee present will bear Elder Robinson out in denying that he made any such statement.** What he did say was, that the only fair way to proceed would be to call for volunteers to form the nucleus, or charter members of the church, which step was taken.

Other statements and omissions in Mr. Stones' report I would be glad to notice, but do not feel free to trespass further upon your valuable space.

**Thanking you in anticipation** for your magnanimity in allowing the space for this correction, I remain

Yours truly,

A. T. ROBINSON.

---

Mr. Eylar, editor, writes as follows:

October 7, 1913, there appeared in the Central Union Outlook, of which Eld. A. T. Robinson was at that time editor, an article of which the following is an extract.

"There have come to our desk the first three issues of a new paper, claiming to be an exponent of the "Simon Pure Seventh-day Adventist doctrine." This paper advertises two books, one of which is entitled "Forty Fatal Errors," and the other bears the title, "Cast Out." These two books are by the same author. On reading the first named of these books, one finds that it is an attempt on the part of the author to point out forty fatal errors in the doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists. On noting the other book and seeing the suggestive title, "Cast Out," one might be led to suppose that the author had succeeded in casting out the forty fatal errors."

To begin with, The Gathering Call has never claimed to be "**An exponent of the Simon Pure Seventh-day Adventist doctrine,**" as an examination of its files plainly show.

The **next attempt** at misrepresentation in this article is the statement that "This paper advertises two books, one of which is entitled, Forty Fatal Errors."

One reason why this statement is untrue is the fact that there has never appeared in any issue of The Gathering Call any mention of the book, Forty Fatal Errors.

Upon receipt of this paper I wrote to Eld. Robinson, calling his attention to his having misrepresented us, and instead of his making any apology, to his readers or to us, for making these false statements, he writes as follows:

College View, Nebraska.

October 15, 1913.

---

Mr. Lee Eylar,  
Alderson, Okla.

Dear Brother: Replying to yours of recent date, concerning note published in the Outlook of last week; In looking up the copies of the paper referred to in the note published in the Outlook, the first two issues of the paper have not been preserved, and by referring to two later issues of the same paper, I do not find "Forty Fatal Errors" noticed therein. This leads me to suspect that it is **more than possible** that it may not have been in the **first two issues**. When writing the note referred to I **felt certain that** I had seen the two books referred to advertised in the paper of which the note made mention.

The note published in the Outlook **was intended to deal especially with the two books** referred to and **only mentioned incidentally the paper** in which I felt certain at the time I had seen these two books mentioned.

Sincerely yours,

A. T. ROBINSON.

---

It seems strange that, after commencing such a campaign of **misrepresentation against us**, Eld. Robinson should set up such a **howl upon the exposure** of some of his **crooked work in St. Louis**.

We hope and pray that the time will soon come when all organizations, patterned after the **papal system**, will have been **broden down**, and **such methods** as were used by **Eld. Robinson** and his **associates** at St. Louis will not be employed.

The following Scripture plainly shows who are NOT "The Remnant": "The remnant of Israel will not do iniquity, **nor speak lies**; neither shall a **deceitful tongue**

be found in their mouth for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid."—Zep. 3:13.

Lee Eylar.

### **Extracts from an Article by Eld. G. B. Thompson in "Review and Herald," October 5, 1911**

The foes of God's people and work have not always been from without. From within have appeared wolves clothed in church livery, who have sought to hinder the work of God. In the days of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram rose up against the leaders. They charged Moses with usurping his position. Is it a small thing that "thou . . . make thyself a prince over us?" was their cry. With a rebellious heart they said, "We will not come up." They were amenable to no leadership; they rejected all rulership except their own. "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy," was the language of rebellion.

In apostolic times, false teachers took from the Galatian church the true gospel, and substituted another, which was not the gospel. The believers in Asia departed from the faith, under the leadership of Phygellus and Hermogenes, who were doubtless apostates from the faith, yet no doubt claiming "new light." Hymenaeus and Philetus taught that the "resurrection is past already," and overthrew the faith of some. No matter what is taught somebody will believe it. Paul and other of the apostles had enemies, and no doubt the dissatisfied elements which were in the church gathered around these blind leaders, and made quite a showing. Some doubtless claimed that Alexander and Hymenaeus should not have been turned out of the church, and strengthened them in their apostasy and wrong course by unwise sympathy.

Yet notwithstanding all these and numerous other adverse experiences, the gospel moved on and triumphed. The people which the Lord brought out of Egypt entered Canaan in spite of all the Korahs, Dathans, and Abirams. And Paul wrote that the gospel in his day had gone to all the world.

Truth can not be stamped out. The Bible has been ridiculed, hated, and despised, but it keeps on multiplying.

The last message will pass through experiences similar to those which the church has met in all ages. It has been assailed all through its history. It has had to contend with critics of various caliber, from the honest, perplexed doubter, to the outspoken skeptic and apostate. Men have risen among us, begun a warfare on former brethren, and sought to tear down what they once tried to build up; but up to the present they have neither torn down the message nor built up anything.

When men left our ranks in the earlier days of the message, they said so, took an open stand, and began their fight; but more recently the tactics of open opposition to the message have been changed. Modern opposers put up the claim that they represent the original message; that while the whole movement has been side-tracked, they believe as they always have, not having moved a hair's breadth.

When Lucifer began his warfare against the government of heaven, he, too, claimed to be loyal. He could deceive his former associates better this way; and it took the Creator a long time to remove the mask, and disclose the real condition, so that all in the universe could understand the matter.

Some have left us, and declared they would never fight the message. But it is difficult for a man going over Niagara to stop when he is half-way down. Erelong some pretext has been found on which to hang an excuse to begin the work of opposition.

But against what have the campaigns of those who have given up the message been waged? What is their mission? Do they raise large funds to plant missions in heathen lands to teach the gospel? The writer has never known of a single instance where this has been done. Do they organize an educational work, and build institutions in which to train the youth for the work of saving souls? We never heard of such steps being taken.

Instead of appealing to the ungodly to lead a better life, they hover **around our churches**, and directly, or

through some sympathizer, seek financial help, to have, perhaps, the tithe diverted from its proper channel into their own pockets. Think of it! While nursing their spiritual mother for sustenance, they seek at the same time to strangle her. They present the strange spectacle of seeking to extinguish the fire around which they gather for warmth.

Do they establish printing houses, and produce literature for the masses, to teach them the gospel? Do they send forth workers to labor among the millions who are unprepared to meet God in the judgment? It seems not. Their mission appears to be to tear down the work of their former brethren, to hold up to the gaze of an unfriendly world what they claim to be the errors of those whom they once fellowshipped.

The tracts and publications of those who leave the message are sent almost exclusively to Seventh-day Adventist churches and ministers. I have found these leaflets in distant parts of the world, not in the homes of heathen and unbelievers but in the homes of those who are striving to keep God's law, and prepare to the best of their ability for a home in heaven. The literature seems to have been prepared and sent out for the express purpose of wrecking confidence in the message; but it gives no certain hope in its place.

Anybody can burn a house or scuttle a ship. It requires no fasting and prayer to sow doubt and divide a church, which has been built up by consecrated labor. The only wonder is that any are so blind that they can not understand the spirit which inspires such work as that pointed out.

### AN OPEN LETTER.

**Extracts from Article by Elder Rupert in "The Gathering Call," June, 1914**

Choctaw, Okla., Oct. 19, 1911.

I saw in the Review of October 5 an article written by you entitled "Opposition to the Message." In this, the general trend is to show that all who have been shut

out by the **federation of some would-be leaders** are classed as Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and so on. I could not help noting the exalted position in which you and your associates had been placed by yourself in this article, viz., the **position of Moses, Paul and others**. This, in your mind, doubtless makes a wide separation between you and yourself, as I am one of the class shut out.

Now, brother Thompson, I had hoped that **disposition would cease in our brethren**, and they would be led to see their **self-exaltation**, but alas, almost every article of the kind referred to resorts to this method. It is, however, only what we may expect of those who **oppose truth**, and **will not accept it**. That same argument has been used against every reform ever started, and those texts are the ones relied on to hold the lay members, and from this standpoint we ought to have known that you would do the same.

From ancient times there have been those who claimed that they sat in **Moses' seat**; but the trouble is, they sit in the **seat of the papacy**, or "**man of sin**." You ought to know better than to **defame your brethren thus**, and exalt yourself as you do. It is not only **selfish but devilish**. You ought to know, and no doubt do know, if you will but think, that there is but one appointed way to meet error, and that is by the word of God, thus showing, if possible, the position of those differing from you, to be wrong. This plan would appeal to the minds of all fair-minded people. But your tactics only aggravate and drive brethren farther from those who resort to such methods. You ought to know this by experience with those not of the Seventh-day Adventist faith.

There is another point I would call your attention to, that is, writing articles of that kind against any class that cannot defend themselves before the people in the same paper, especially the Review. In the eyes of God and every fair-minded person, these men have an **equal right to that paper with yourself**. **To build it up they have done equally as much, to say the least**; but, owing to your **federation**, they have been shut out. And now for you to thus take advantage of them in this manner is **wicked**,



**unjust, and cowardly** on your part. And right here I **challenge** you, or **anyone** appointed by the General Conference, to meet me (in any fair way) either in a **written or oral discussion** of the subjects in my writings to which you object. And this I do that the people may have a chance to hear both sides of the question.

This is Christian fairness, but your plan of procedure is **spiritual cowardice**. Anyone can do what you are doing; it requires neither wisdom nor means. All that is necessary is to **belong to the confederacy**, and that, no doubt, accounts for the appearance of such articles, which have no evidence within themselves, but only the sayings of those who would be Moses, and resting upon the authority with which they think they are invested.

You further ask, where is one of these men who, having gone out from us, has raised up living churches from the fruit of his own planting, established missions in foreign lands, established schools and institutions, written books, etc.

We are willing to admit, personally, that after serving God under the direction of the denomination for over thirty years, during the prime of life; forsaking all for that service; **losing health and eyesight as a result of that service**; then, **robbed by the denomination of the inheritance and "fruit of my planting"** which God has provided for His aged servants; we say we admit, to be thus **turned out penniless**, it would be most difficult, from a worldly standpoint, to accomplish these great feats mentioned by you. But we are glad the promise is written, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." God has chosen the weak instruments of the world to confound the mighty. On these promises, and in His name, we press forward to finish our course with joy, with full assurance that the light He has given us (now in the publications which your denomination has rejected, unread), will yet shine forth to the conversion and joy of many hearts.

You say again, "these men were not of us; they went out from us." This is a perversion of scripture: John says these men were anti-Christ. They were opposing

Christ and His work. The only sense therefore in which you would have any right to use that scripture thus **would be to place yourself** in the place of Christ, as you have in that of Moses. Then were you to vote on the **infallibility** of your **position**, as was done in 1870 by the **papacy**, you would have an image to **the beast** in the fullest sense.

It is true we have not traveled in as many Pullman cars as some, we have not drawn as high wages as some, we have not traveled around the world **to locate mission stations from the car window as some**; but we believe if you will follow the footsteps of your brother into the thousands of homes of the common people, hold as many meetings in new fields, raised up the hundreds of converts, written, published and sold as much literature, go through the actual hardships of actual missionary pioneering, suffer the losses and sorrows that service has entailed, I believe you would be more cautious and Christ-like in your statements.

You may have the power to **lock meeting houses**, you may control certain **printing presses**, you may **prejudice the minds** of the people until they have neither kind words nor support for us, you may make our work hard for us; but God's power will overturn all this nefarious work to His praise, and the good of the true and loyal to Him.

Not satisfied with owning the people, this confederacy desires, also, to control all territory. All territory is covered by conference boundaries, thus taking out a conference patent on the same; and the nearer one preaches according to their own profession, but not bowing to the leadership, the more bitter they are against him; thus showing that submission to the leadership is the real thing required.

This is the fruit manifested, not only in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination but in all organizations patterned after the papal system. Now the S. D. A. form of **church government** is **purely human and unscriptural**; hence we must expect just such **manifestations and confederacies** of leaders as we now see.

### Comments on the Foregoing Extracts

Brother Rupert, let us try to be fair. I know our zeal often pushes us unconsciously beyond the channel of fairness, and very often it grows up into unkindness. Do you think it fair to intimate that a man, because he tries to preach what Moses or Paul preached, assumes their seat or their high position? Now you try to give the Third Angel's Message—is it fair for me to say you claim to be an angel, or because you claim to preach the gospel of Christ therefore you are Christ? Look at some of these words and phrases you use right in the same letter where you complain about our brethren's unkindness (in which we might expect an exhibition of great kindness), but instead what do you call it? This, too, was published far and near. I naturally suppose you referred to the most unkind words that you could find so as to make your point strong. Evidently there is nothing stronger before 1911 put on record, and as you waited till 1914 to make your complaint public you found nothing stronger since or you would have referred to it, and this period covers the crisis of this whole movement. These must be the most unkind words spoken up to the present. What will you say about what I have said?

“If you were busy being kind,  
Before you knew it, you would find  
You'd soon forget to think 'twas true,  
That some one was unkind to you.”

I can understand better why our brethren have kept as quiet as they have and gone right along about their work and so followed the example of Moses, leaving the Lord to take care of such movements instead of trying to defend themselves. They are too busy. It is well expressed in the following verse:

“They find themselves too busy quite  
To stop their work of doing right,  
And condescend as I have done,  
And give attention to any one.”

Read the “Gathering Call.” Listen at the wails and

cries of these poor "castouts" and these miserably mistreated souls. Why, it would bring tears to your eyes if you did not know something of this people yourself. It would be wonderful if in all these experiences there was no mistake made at all, but I don't believe it will average one in ten. I know the people too well to believe otherwise. Elder Ballenger told me himself that the brethren treated him kindly. Yet I am sorry to say he has to join in to some extent with these wailers. Jones, too, to hear his story, has been very, very badly treated. Last but not least we hear Rupert. See it in the above quotation, viz., "After serving God under the direction of the denomination for over thirty years, during the prime of my life, forsaking all for that service, losing health and eyesight, as a result of that service, then robbed by the denomination of the inheritance and fruit of my planting which God has provided for His aged servants, we say we admit to be thus turned out penniless, it would be most difficult from a worldly standpoint to accomplish these great feats mentioned by you."

These men, nearly all, have had their hobbies and did not keep them to themselves, but rode them to the front and insisted on being heard and persisted in it, year in and year out, making it the message itself, till they nullified all the good they did and more too, like Ballenger, who says he tried for four years to get our brethren to see his new light. Remember, Brother B. was drawing wages all this time, doing that kind of work.

I know how our brethren felt about it long before he was dropped from the work; we all felt badly about it. The same thing was true of Rupert and others embracing such things and pushing them to the front. While other men may hold some peculiar views of their own, they do not make them the message. I may have some peculiar views of my own about writing this article, as I have not counselled with my brethren; they might decide if I followed it up year in and year out, that I better drop it and so report to me their findings, viz., "Now, Elder, don't you know you can't cope with the great master mind, the leader in all rebellions, who was the first 'out-

cast'? You can't say anything just to suit the occasion, you can't resort to trickery and deception; you know how he handled the heavenly host and the great company he called out from that great throng with all the wisdom of heaven against him."

Even if I was not fully convinced, would it not be the part of wisdom for me to submit my opinion to theirs? But if I persisted in it, why should the church be deprived of its God-given liberty, yea, duty to cut me off so as to lessen my influence to the minimum in the cause we represent and thus protect the innocent and uninformed as far as possible and thus show I was not a man in good standing; though perhaps no one could say that my moral standing was not above reproach? The better my moral standing might be, the more harm I could do the cause of God. I could do it more injury if my morals were good than I could by committing the worst of sins, hence I would be a greater enemy and a more dangerous man.

Now, Elder Rupert, let us look at this complaint that is now sounded abroad far and near. You "served God under the direction of the denomination." So did I, and I am not sorry. I thank God I had the privilege. "For over thirty years," yea, more than thirty-six, during the "prime of my life." I, too, commenced at 24 years of age; worked till I was 61, yes, lost my health and the use of my right hand, so I have had to teach my left hand to write the last three years; but I can not blame all these infirmities to my service to God, for I think I am better off in health by accepting the lessons that I have received from this service than I would have been otherwise. Neither has the denomination robbed me of one cent, but gave me a good living—all I ever was worth to the cause, sometimes I think more. My health at 61 compelled me to retire to hard-handed labor for self-support. Not a penny have I received from any source only from my own hands and with God's blessings I have been able to add my mite to the treasury of the Lord the last twelve years. Such complaint as this has but little influence upon my mind. I know the human heart too well. Now if I should turn around and go to these churches that I

have built up and commence to tear them down and divide them, what could I hope for my salary? Suppose a railroad employee should turn about and refuse to do his work as he had been doing and ignore the company's rules and plans; would they, should they, keep him and pay him his salary; if not could he go off and put up a mournful plea that he had been turned out penniless, aged, and blind? We all know what they would do with a man of that kind—ship him at once—a man unreliable in his work, here today and there tomorrow, always with some new scheme to amend, change, or modify the rules, plans, or regulations. Yet there is no association in the world who looks after their crippled, aged, and infirm better than this association.

I feel that the most unkind word that I have used in this whole article is the word "rebellion," and I don't believe that our leading brethren in all they have said have used as plain and strong language as I have used, yet they are accused of being unkind. I have placed side by side their words and the words of these men that have been published, as far as I know. So you can see for yourself. While I have not put in all of any long article on either side, yet I have put all that looks like any unkindness of heart from both sides, or that might be made to appear that way.

In my first interview with these men, when they came here to College View, in less than an hour one of them challenged me for debate, something I never did in all my life, to challenge any one. And all of this kind of work I ever got into was on a run to keep out of it. But I did, however, reply, I will go with you to your satisfaction, to the homes of your hearers when you get ready to pay them missionary visits, if you will give me an equal chance and let me know when you are ready. You see that allowed them the advantage of instructing their hearers in the evenings, but they never called on me.

I have spoken about public conflicts of this kind in another place, but I want to say here that I never saw the day when I wore the war-paint the thickest that I would go into a public debate with a man known as a

S. D. A. and allow the report to go out that two S. D. A.'s were in a battle. Mr. Bryan utterly refused to accept a challenge to meet Senator Bailey (a Democrat) of Texas as long as he bore that name. He said he had too much respect for the party they represented, and that very fact showed how much respect Mr. Bailey had for their cause.

In Elder Spicer's letter to Jones not one word of unkindness can be found in it, but all is in perfect keeping with the salutation, "Dear Brother." Elder Robinson's letter was after the same order. His letter is found in the "Gathering Call" headed "Objections Answered." While this calls up a controversy, I shall not attempt to discuss its merits, for that is not the point we are looking after, but unkind treatment. And while you are looking at these words of the Editor, notice the character of these misrepresentations.

One is, Elder Robinson, like myself, thought they claimed to be giving the simon-pure S. D. A. doctrine. Do you not claim to be giving the simon-pure Seventh-day doctrine and the simon-pure Adventist doctrine? If you say no, I will not take issue with you, because I agree with you and have learned you do not even claim it, and on that point I am willing to be corrected; but if you say yes, how far out of the way was Elder Robinson?

Next Elder Robinson thought you advertised your honorable Author's Book "Forty Fatal Errors," but you had not. Do you think it would disgrace or injure you to advertise it in any way? If not, did Robinson injure you in stating you advertised it? If not, wherein are you hurt in either one of these "misrepresentations," as you call them? Now, are you not, my brother, hard pressed to find malicious misrepresentations? This all shows that Robinson might have been your dearest friend and represented you thus as it is nothing but a friendly mistake. Please analyze these words, "Such a campaign of misrepresentation against us"; "Set up such a howl"; "Of this (your) crooked work"; "Patterned after the papal system." Then you apply the following: "The remnant will not do iniquity nor speak lies, neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth."

I confess I have never seen the columns of any of my papers more completely filled with gall bitterness and vituperation, even political papers in the white heat of their campaigns seldom excel it. Look at the "Gathering Call" for the last six months. Can you find one out of that number that has passed by the S. D. A.'s without throwing clubs at them? And some of them have very little else only clubs in them. We used to have a story we told to illustrate this point: A fruit tree full of clubs indicated that it bore good fruit, for every idle boy passing would throw a club to knock off some fruit. Even Ballenger is not so busy but he has time to give us a blow almost if not in every issue. He picks up all our little mistakes and blunders and if he can not find enough himself he takes up with second-hand stuff to fill the columns of his paper. And anyone that is gifted on this line is sure to find ample space, if not crowded out by the many clamoring to be heard on the same line.

Paul says, 1 Cor. 11:1: "Be ye followers of me even as I also am of Christ." (See also 4:16.) Paul has given us an example how to speak of those who have given up and gone off from the message, and I think Elder Thompson very softly and politely speaks of these cases. Read Paul's words, where he says he has delivered Hymeneus to Satan (Tim. 1:20). That is, he had withdrawn from him (some people say "cast out"). See 1 Cor. 5:1, 9, 11, 13. Then he says their words (I suppose he means their preaching or at least what they say about this message they had given up) ate like a canker or gangrene. Is it not a duty of every government to point out and describe the movements, the points of attack of those who are waging a warfare against them, also to describe their banner and uniform as plainly as possible? So no one will be taken unawares. How much more the church of God. Paul thought so, I am sure, or he would not have spoken so plainly.

### CHALLENGE

Now, Elder Jones, as to that challenge to Elders Daniells, Spicer, Prescott, or any other man, I will say



what I think about it. These men are all very busy men. It might be a very serious question in the minds of these men whether they would be justified in ignoring and disregarding such as the following scriptures: Rom. 1:28-32, which classifies all such disputings and debates with all unrighteousness, maliciousness, back-biters and haters of God. Paul says that there are many of these unruly and vain talkers. Titus 1:10. "Unruly,"—not according to the rule, the Word of God. He further says "if any man [I suppose that means any of these men, or Jones either] obey not our word, note that man and have no company with him." 2 Thess. 3:14. And again, "if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20.

Now you know our cause has passed that station (debating station), and we will be loathe to stop the whole train and go back. We might if some poor soul was in great need and that was the only way to help him on his journey. You see it is this way: If a man is so blinded in his mind and becomes so wreckless in what he says that he could openly violate one line of Scriptures in order to put up a defense on his position on something else—gospel order or anything—we would have no assurance that he was sufficiently conscientious not to do the same thing right over if there seemed to be any necessity for it. For you know, Brother Jones, if a man can treat one scripture lightly he can others without any compunction of conscience, because he is used to it.

Now we have a man who will meet you at any time or place, and he will not place you under any restrictions, law or order, but accept you on your honor, expecting you to be fair, with the understanding that you will reaffirm what you said here in College View, December, 1913, viz., that you now preach and believe the same as you did on organization twenty years ago.

I see, Elder Jones, in your letters to Elder Spicer, that you very seriously question the truthfulness of the impression that has gone out that you have "given up or gone off from the Third Angel's Message, or any single truth of that Message," or wherein you have

"given up or gone off from **any single truth of any kind.**" I notice that you have repeated this phrase several times in this short epistle, or nearly the same statement, and the fourth time it is stated it seems to be a little broader than the preceding statements. As the greater always includes the less, so this fourth statement, "**from any single truth of any kind,**" includes the other three. Of course you mean this as you have stated, because you emphasize it so very strongly in your second letter and the fifth paragraph, saying: "You cannot truthfully tell of any truth that I have given up or gone off from."

Now, of course, I do not know just how much these brethren, to whom you refer, know, but I think I know; but I do not say that you know that you have gone off and given up **any single truth of any kind**, but I think Jones No. 1 knows that you have gone off and given up at least one single truth. See Exhibit A, "The Papacy." Was it the truth that we were not the papacy then? That was the trend of all your (Jones No. 1) teachings, that was his belief, if we can give credit to what a man says. Then he said, "you need not fear the Papacy or even talk about it," but now we are more papalistic than anything proposed in the Middle Ages. "Not only like the papacy, but are the papacy." And you said then that God and Christ were in this (which you now call) very papalistic church. You declared at that time, that we need not fear the papacy, but now you turn right about face and have gone off the other way and have given up that great truth that God is in this very church. **Is that not "any truth of any kind"?** Yea more, is it not one great truth of the most important kind? You cannot argue that the organization has changed, for it is just the same, as we all know.

As Jones No. 1, you said, "Bulletin," p. 93, "Christ is in the church; His testimony is in the church, and the church belongs to Him." Now read right along and we will see you refer to the S. D. A. church. "And if nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand" of the church "should set themselves to destroy organization from among Seventh-day Adventists, they could not do it.

The disorganizers would drop off, and the cause go on gloriously." Did Elder Jones believe and preach the Third Angel's Message at this time, February, 1899? Is this not a part of it? and was not the form of our organization the same then as now? But what does he now say? "The form of the Seventh-day Adventist organization of the denomination is professedly of the Mosaic order and this to the exclusion of the Christian order." See "Appeal," pp. 33-37. And he further says, "It is nothing else than to abandon Christ and the Christian order wholly." And this very quotation to which he refers has been written and published again and again for over forty years.

We will refer to Exhibit B on organization. Now did Jones No. 1 believe and preach "any kind of a truth" in his statements fourteen years ago, as quoted above? Just as certainly as Jones No. 1 preached any truth of any kind at the South Lancaster Conference, just so certainly Jones No. 2 has given up and gone back on some truth of at least one kind which he then believed. And we might say many truths of many kinds, and these statements of his were of that kind that flow out from the deep movings of the Great Spirit of that consecrated hour. He even went so far as to declare as his belief, at that time, that when the committee would formulate the conclusions of our discussions at that conference, we would have the voice of the conference and that would be the voice of God.

The then "present organization, exactly as it is" (was then) "wheels," "machinery," and all, "was God's own" (organization) and "the Lord has held us together all these years in spite of the fact that this body was no longer His voice, that now we turn about and do the best we can do, do you suppose the work is going to pieces?" "If 999 out of every thousand of the church should set themselves to destroy organization from among the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, they could not do it." Why say, "It is God's own," for "God is in it"; "Christ is in it"; "His testimony is in it"? What church, what organization is he talking about? The S. D. A. church

organization. Christ is the head of it (church), and "the church belongs to Him." The disorganizers would drop off but the cause would go on gloriously.

Loughborough says at this conference, "if I understand the keynote of these talks, they are not for abolishing the organization, but for having more of God."—"Bulletin," p. 93.

This was the Third Angel's Message then, believed by Jones No. 1 and all the rest of us; but is it now believed by him or does he repudiate it? No one can deny but what it was at least a "one single truth" of the Third Angel's Message at that time.

Well, if it is neither the message nor a single truth of the message, is it not "**any truth of any kind**"? If not, was he in the habit of not preaching any truth of any kind? Then if this is "any truth of any kind," it comes within the terms of his challenge even if it is not the message itself, or "not one single truth of the message," but only "**a truth of any kind.**"

It is evident that he has given up and gone off from this truth, and he does not dare deny it. Hence, Elders Spicer, Daniells, and Prescott have not created a false impression, and what they have said is true and of course they nor any other man could know it to be false.

Now Jones No. 1 says, page 74 of the "Bulletin," "I want the General Conference to prosper, the State conferences, ministry, and everything to prosper." Does Jones No. 2 want the General Conference, etc., to prosper when it is "papalistic"?

Was that a truth of any kind? You cannot ring in changes on the organization to justify your change of attitude, for the machinery was the same then, the wheels just as numerous, and the organization of the same old original form, now as then. If it is Mosaic now, it was then; if a federation now, it was then; if papalistic now, it was then; and the only thing different that I can think of is we had Jones with us then, but now he is against us. We had conferences, General Conference, delegates, committees, nominations, elections, presidents, etc. All of which was a well-known truth of the message, and have you not gone back on all of them?

If Rupert knew what he was talking about when he said Jones had lined up with him on the 2300 days, and it was not a strained effort on the part of both of them to agree while they were here, then perhaps he will stay lined up so he will not need any one to show him that he has changed—everybody will know it.

It is natural for us all to take the easiest way to do any and everything. It is much easier to bring charges and railing accusations than to give the evidence, facts or reasons, for often there are none at all. I look with more confidence upon a cause whose advocates indulge in giving evidence or reasons or what appears to them to be such, and let the people draw their own conclusions and bring their own charges. A man or cause who has plenty of facts for defense is perfectly satisfied to present them and hence have but little room for accusations. I look with great suspicion upon a man's cause who indulges in great conclusions from little evidence, or a man who chooses rather to tackle his opponent's illustration than his argument; for a man's illustrations might be very weak, but his arguments unanswerable. They are given to enforce and make clear an argument, but do not add anything to the evidence. Every public man uses illustrations. Lawyers understand this, so often they seize just the illustration or figure used knowing a figure has many sides, so they just turn another side and the jury thinks he has turned the argument of his opponent when he has not touched the argument or facts, and so deceives the jury. And notice that all rebels against light and truth indulge very largely in all the above. Now we do not say that they do not have or use any truth, for they do—a lot of it, but just enough of the other to change it into an untruth.

The great master mind in rebellion brought against God in heaven very serious charges and argued them so staunchly that he took in the third part of the angels and deceived himself with his own arguments as well as them. Let us study the characteristics of such elements and avoid them. There are plenty on record for our admonitions. Why did not Elder Jones in this article referred

to, instead of making this serious charge against Elder Spicer, just give the Bible evidence that Elder Spicer in talking on gospel order had read "a number of things into the Bible that are not in any sense true and are shown by the plain words of the Bible to be false"? But here not one thing out of many did he even attempt to show. Neither did he attempt to show how he read it into the Bible, by misquoting or by drawing conclusions Elder Jones says it is not true. He then closes with a wish that the S. D. A. may find "a real Christian care for the genuine openness and sincerity of the truth and what the Bible does really say."

Well, according to that, if we ever had it we have lost it, or else we never had it. And if we never had it, it took him over a quarter of a century to find that out. Why not instead of just saying or assuming this point, **attempt** at least to prove it; and allow all of his readers to have a little part in making up the decision. But no, instead he just turns out a lot of his conclusions all made up and worded to his own liking. Thank you, Brother Jones, I do not care for that kind of dishes. Thank you, Mr. Editor, I can not give place to that kind of a "Gathering Call."

The great pioneer or leader in rebellion, who was next to Christ most honored of God and highest in power and glory among all the angelic host, began to dispute the supremacy of Christ and thus impeached the wisdom of the Creator in His wise and orderly arrangements, and like Korah, Dathan and Abiram commenced his work by finding fault with the government and brought all his great power of eloquence to bear. He convinced a large number of the angels from time to time, evidently by giving great flaming reports of his success more than anything else, for he could make the most out of that. He artfully presented his side of the question, employing sophistry and fraud, and so disguised himself under a cloak of falsehood and deception that he caught many of his friends. Heaven exerted all its powers to have him return. In heart and soul he was convinced he was wrong, and was almost persuaded under the influence of

the assembled host to confess. His heart was thrilled with love and for a time carried him, but he soon relapsed and more fully than before determined to carry out his purpose and thus prosecute his plan to a finish.

This is a type, a figure, a sample of all rebellion, but very different from a God-directed reformation. The enemy has his way. But it has its own peculiar characteristics. It is our privilege to study and know which is which. Reformers do not go back and confess that they were inspired by Satan, then go back on their confession and commence the same work over.

Now we have called attention to a number of these moves, both of God and the fallen foe, reformations and rebellions. The rebellious all seem to commence with famous men, men of renown, next to the very highest authority; and they all seem to have the same experience that Satan had—almost persuaded at times to give it up and come back to the fold.

Let us look at those we know the most about. We will commence with Moses Hull, who was a very strong speaker—swept everything before him. His opponents stood little show with him. But after going off into spiritualism he came back and confessed he had been led off by the devil. I have not his confession at hand.

Look at Snook. "I confess I was led by the wicked one. \* \* \* Awful convictions seized me and I was unhappy day and night. \* \* \* While in this state of darkness I felt hampered and chained and longed for freedom. So I determined to confess. Then I felt the blessing of God return to me, then the discrepancies began to take wings and fly away."

Brinkerhoff says: "I have been deeply under the influence of Satan, \* \* \* also to Brother and Sister White let me say I was in the wrong, not you. \* \* \* I have acted so cruelly and altogether unwarrantably toward you I was poisoned in mind and blinded by prejudice. \* \* \* My feet are now taken out of the miry clay and fixed on the sure foundation of truth. God will take care of this truth and send confusion and weakness upon those who like some people anciently thought to stay the work of God."

How literally this last statement has been fulfilled.

Hear what Ball says: "I have been blinded by his dark influence and controlled by his satanic power. \* \* \* It is spiritual death to doubt or oppose any part of this work."

Elder Canright's statement appeared in the "Review and Herald" of October 7, 1884. As this is a very straight talk to my old brethren, I trust Elder Canright will not take any offense, for I do not want to stir up any bad blood. The Elder still lives and has joined the peace movement, and we both expect to be at peace with one another for the rest of our lives.

After the first year or two of opposition he settled down to a more consistent course than these others. He did not attempt to head a rebellion and inaugurate a reformation. So his course was not cloaked in mystery and so wrapped in deception that loyal ones could not see his purpose. Hence, his course was less like that of the great master of rebellions. He came out openly, and we could all see his true position. For this reason he caused less division than the others. Not because he was a weaker man—far from it; but he was too frank and open for the enemy to use to advantage.

I will quote from his confession but a few paragraphs to show his true position: "I saw that I had put a wrong meaning on some things, and other things were certainly true. If these were true I had certainly been wrong all the way through. Light came into my mind, and for the first time in years I could truly say I believed the Testimonies. \* \* \* Everything looked different. \* \* \* Then I felt how wrong and sinful and in the dark I had been. \* \* \* How clear and connected, how marvelously beautiful the whole system looked to me. \* \* \* Light and faith came into my soul and I felt that God had given me a new heart. Now I believe the message as firmly and more understandingly than ever before. \* \* \* I am fully satisfied that my own salvation and my usefulness in saving others depends upon my being connected with this people and this work."

All these confessions referred to were voluntarily



made and written by the hands of the men themselves, and were all published in the "Review and Herald" under their direction and have appeared in its columns several times since.

It would be supposed that after all these experiences, after being warned and forewarned over and over again, not one of this people would ever be caught in this way again, but here we come to the same experience again, and find a rebellion excelling all the others, strange, mysterious and unaccountable, clothed in a mystery, difficult to disclose to the people the true nature of its work, claiming to be the simon pure, clear and unadulterated Third Angel's Message itself; the leader, without doubt the leader, claiming to believe it all, every item; saying he has believed and preached the same for more than twenty years, Testimonies and all, but see:

"I might say this, however, that I have never yet known Sr. White to make a mistake when she wrote what she was shown by vision concerning things I believe everything of that kind has stood the test. On the other hand, she has many times made statements and written statements that did not prove to be absolutely correct because of some wrong information or lack of judgment." This is a quotation Elder Jones gives in his leaflet "Appeal," p. 61. Then he says, "Yet in substance it [this quotation] is my position," p. 62.

Then he is sure that he has not given up any truth of any kind and he stigmatizes any man who says he has of misrepresenting him, at least he names three of our men. Then he undertakes to show that we are off, that the Seventh-day Adventists have gone back and refused the Christian order, gone back on the mark of the beast. In fact the Third Angel's Message, as the Third Angel's Message which is now due, is to preach against church federation. But he says the Seventh-day Adventist church is a federation church, and how can they do it? Now we will follow this up and see if the Lord has chosen him to bring in a reformation and change our old platform and thus take this cause out of the hands of the old workers and set them right, as some of them still live who

helped to lay this foundation. If so, here is an exception to all the great moves of the past. Now follow me on. Let us see.

The confessions of these men show that rebellion against this work is of the enemy and led by him and just as conclusively shows that this is the Lord's work. So it seems by a singular providence that these men, leading men, eloquent men, our best preachers, not poor weaklings such as might be easily influenced to change, but exceptionally strong-minded men, were compelled to come back and confess frankly that their work was of the devil. And none of the friends of this cause ever questioned that. Well, the remnant of that rebellion still exists. That was forty-nine years ago. Ten years after Goodenough, their leader, boasted of forty ministers and 600 members. What have they now?

The great leader in all these moves was not well pleased with these confessions. Neither has he been satisfied with the efforts of their remnant for the last score of years. They have been too quiet, too harmless and tame to carry his work in the very last of the last days. So he must inaugurate a new movement and one that will go through to the end. One that will be more formidable than any of its predecessors. With chosen men as leaders that will not retract and confess and thus give away his cause. Men that must be less conscientious than their predecessors; self-conceited, very proud of their opinions, and just as confident and certain in a thing that has no semblance of truth in it as they are in even the most self-evident truths; clearness of statement, great power of reasoning, uncompromising in argument; so much so that they will be able to deceive even themselves and so become very sincere even to the shedding of tears; men of very stubborn and iron wills who will die before they will yield. Then he gives them a long training before he puts them out in the open field, not allowing them to jump into the battle with just a few months' exercise and would have them move slowly and softly, step by step until they are well grounded and settled so as to make it the next thing to an impossibility for them to retreat. Perhaps this

is the only kind of a movement that will awake and keep awake all of us and cause us to study the Message and know it as we have never known it before. He don't propose to lift the curtain and let them see at one view what they must and will do. So they will find themselves doing many things they never planned to do and when they started on this course they were very sure they never would do. Ballenger planned to go on the farm and never take the field of opposition against us—Jones planned to take the lecture field and let us alone. When he first came to Lincoln to give his first lectures I could not persuade him to come up to College View and even stay all night with me for he said he proposed to stay away for he might be misjudged, but now he says he came here without any plan or purpose of his own and has stayed for weeks waging a war of opposition without any plan of his own.

This movement is definitely and clearly of the same family as these others spoken of before. Like them they say the foundation stones are not all right. The sanctuary question and our views on the atonement and the 2300 days are all wrong and above all, in all and through all our old and long established views on organization are wrong, and so far wrong that to cling to them "is to abandon the Christian order and to take the course of the papacy."

If it was simply additional light like temperance or justification by faith that would not be rebellion against God or His movements in the earth but be in harmony with His unfolding work. This work or this effort of these men from start to finish both in tendency and purpose (I mean the purpose of the great master mind) is to tear down, hinder and destroy our work. So I say if this is a reform it is an exception to all the great reforms that God ever had anything to do with, but **does** carry the marks of all the rebellions among God's people. As we have said, in all these great movements, where is there one case where God had to drop the original leaders in that special work and call another set to correct their errors? He did not drop Noah and his family and take another. Nor did he do

this with Abraham. He did not drop Moses and take up Joshua to start over again in another direction and change His organization. He did not drop the twelve apostles—not even one of them after they entered upon their work. He did not drop Luther, Wesley, nor Miller. Yet they all made mistakes but not as to the foundation of their special work.

But has God allowed the founders of this Third Angel's Message to make a mistake in its very foundation stones so after a few years had to call Ransom Hicks to correct it; then let him fail; then Lonsdale; then Stevenson and Hall; then Kramner; all failing one after another. Now we were ready for another set to try their hand—Snook and Brinkerhoff answered this call—had everything in their favor; quite a large constituency, men of education and learning, but it was too big a job for them and they failed.

Surely if these moves were of God He had a very hard time to find a man to bring about the reforms. So the long-suffering God has waited for seventy years to find the men to do this long delayed work. But here they are after about eight years of training and preparation and all this time advancing and getting ready for it. Now the work has commenced in good earnest and has been going on for some time. Over two months at work here, claiming one hundred converts here and in Lincoln, with about half of them here. I was there five nights and the most I could count was fifty. One bad night only twenty-three and I supposed that measured the interested ones; yet that included me. One Sabbath after the ministers left I counted twenty-two; the same Sabbath at Lincoln there were nineteen. Up here there were twenty-six chairs in the hall. Several good families beside the fault-finding element were present and have taken up with it. We still hope that God may save them from delusion and discouragement.

As the doctrines of our movement are not made up of a long list of negatives and of assailing the errors of the day, but are constructive in their nature and character, I want to close with a few observations on scriptural organization.

## A FEW OBSERVATIONS ON SCRIPTURAL ORGANIZATION.

God has His way and His everyday way of doing things. Then He has a special way under great emergencies. These of course are the exceptions. His ordinary way is the best way, as it brings the best results to the many. The sun rises and sets every twenty-four hours. It rains on the just and unjust. The sun may stand still under great emergency. The rain may be withheld for three years and a half for some special purpose. In short, the everyday operations of the laws of nature are for the best good of mankind or of the many concerned, even though they operate without discrimination and hence without reference to justice. The aged and the little child, the innocent and guilty suffer alike.

But the moral government rests upon a different foundation, justice and mercy are the foundation of its throne. Hence it operates with great discrimination. It has its penalties, consequences and results. These natural laws are God's way of doing in the natural world while the moral laws are His ways of doing in the moral world, with His creatures subject to moral government. God carried out His own plans or purposes according to His own will for "none can stay his hand or say unto him what doest thou?" Dan. 4:35. His will is absolute as to the governing of His own actions pertaining to His own plans or purposes. But as to governing or controlling man His will is contingent or hinged upon man's will and hence is a will of desire.

This is because God made man a free moral agent with the liberty of using his own will as this was for the best good of all concerned and hence being for the best good He placed it in His original plan.

This will of desire is seen in such texts as the following, "Who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." It is God's will that all men should come today and be saved today from sin, but they will not. It is not God's will that men should

steal, but they will. So we see he leaves man as a free moral agent to conform to His will of desire or not.

God's great plan or purpose in the beginning was to people this earth with good people—the kind He placed upon it, who had wills of their own. But when man refused to carry out God's will of desire and so rebelled, then God, to carry out this original plan to people the earth, did not give it up, but went right on and introduced the gospel plan to save them from sin and rebellion that He might carry out His purpose in the creation of the world, still leaving man with that independent will—not changing it in the least. In order to carry out this plan He had to make known His gospel plan to all of His fallen creatures in the world, and as man had refused to have God reign over him by rebelling, so God was compelled to take man to do this work. Now as this work had to be done through the agency of men, Christ became a man to do His part of it (took man's nature, etc., etc.), and became the light of the world. Jno. 9:5. But when He left the world He said to His apostles, especially as they had accepted His call to the work, "Ye are the light of the world." Matt. 5:14. "As my Father sent Me into the world even so send I you." Jno. 20:21. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself \* \* \* and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Cor. 5:19. This was committed to Paul according to the commandment of God our Savior. Titus 1:3. This was to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. 4:6.

It was just the same in the Old Testament. Isa. 49:6. "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." The great commission, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations." Matt. 28, Mark 16, pointed out a great principle of duty, and He expects man to use the sense and reasoning powers that He has so liberally bestowed upon him to study out the little minutiae and in the best possible way to perform that duty and thus carry forward His work in the earth; He says, "Go unto all the world and

preach," but leaves man to devise his own ways and means with a promise of the Spirit's help.

As we have said, God has His way, and one of His ways is to reveal to our senses, eyes, ears, etc., another by direct revelation what cannot be seen with our eyes, etc. But for me to lean down on that text, "We walk by faith and not by sight" (2 Cor. 5:7), and close my eyes and expect God to reveal by faith the objects along the way and keep me safely from stumbling over them, would be foolishness. However, after I have used all my senses to the limit there is far beyond them all a big world for God and faith to operate in, but for me to expect God to relieve me from all anxiety and the exercise of my faculties is presumption and not faith.

"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel." There can be no question but what this is the same gospel, the same light for the same purpose given through the agency of man to all nations in the same way. Why should it be otherwise unless God has changed? We see organization everywhere with our natural eyes and may learn many lessons from some families of the animal kingdom. Leaders are instinctively recognized in herds of wild animals and flocks of wild birds. When the leader gives the alarm, then all in a moment move together. We call this instinct in animals. They seem to understand the points of the compass or the direction they want to go. Little pigs have been removed miles from home and in a few hours returned to their mothers in the darkness of the night. Fish, birds and many others are similar in this respect, but since the fall and our separation from God we see but little of that intuitive knowledge left in us.

A leader signifies a right to act by virtue of office, station or relation and this often is suggested by the natural power of superiority or by the attainments of intelligence in morals or religion, state or churchcraft. But men are left to experiment and reason, but reason cannot do anything unless she has data from which to reason. Reason handles evidence and experience. It cannot create evidence. So without evidence man remains lost, but

with data that his reason can handle he can plough the great deep with a degree of certainty whether in darkness or light and arrive at his port. But it would be a happen-so without this data if two men lost in the woods would agree in the direction for home, and while they would not submit one to the other, they would submit their intelligence to these little animals. They never make a mistake. But God gave man the power to reason from the evidence He has thrown about him, and so we may learn even from the animal creation something on organization.

We see rebellion arising all the way along the pathway of the history of the people of God, and it was always against God's order or arrangement. It is not wonderful or very strange to find this among men on earth, for it was seen among angels in heaven.

God is a God of order, and "all things are to be done decently and in order." 1 Cor. 14:40. The enemy of all truth, of course, has not changed; he is following his same old plans, using his same old tactics and carrying on his work in the same old way. He perverts every right way and always professing to believe the right, changes truth into falsehood, pleasure into pain, happiness into misery, peace and harmony into war and confusion. This is always done by disregarding law and order. This is seen in the charges made by Korah, Dathan and Abiram against Moses and Aaron: "Ye take too much upon you." Num. 16:3. It is that kind of a charge that can be made at any time, at any place, under any circumstances, against any government, any church, any man, or set of men. These men were leading lights: "**Famous** men in the congregation, men of renown." Num. 16:3. They evidently talked it over among themselves (that fault-finding element) and decided that they and their theory of government and organization was not respected as the dignity of their God-given talent demanded.

They considered they had a small place of honor (verse 9) in comparison with Moses, in that great movement. Everything would have been all right, the organization would have been all right if they could have been promoted and become the leaders, then the movement



would prosper and go on; but as it was, they sent out and got their company together and united against Moses and that organized movement. It created quite a sensation at the time, evidently on account of the influence and standing of these men. So Moses was worried and troubled in the very depths of his soul, so he fell on his face and cried to God to know what to do. God had not left him and he would not allow this false movement to interfere with the progress of that God-ordained movement if Moses and his company would only be loyal and faithful. And hence there was no other way for God to do at this time than to take all these leaders out of the way; if not, they would have held the people. It was a great emergency and under ordinary circumstances what followed might look like a hasty and rash act.

Balaam himself was astonished at the harmony and perfect order that he observed in the camp of Israel. Instead of a rude and disorganized multitude "he saw the vast extent and perfect arrangement of their camp, everything bearing marks of thorough discipline and order. So Balaam explains, 'The Lord his God is with him.'" "Patriarchs and Prophets," page 447. You see David held counsel with his leaders (1 Chron. 13:12, "David consulted with the captains of thousands and hundreds and every leader," then laid their decision before the congregation for their approval. This same thing is seen in the New Testament. We see this same unity of association and unity of the churches one with the other the same as the Old Testament order, as in the case of Paul who had the care of all the churches; Titus appointed to Crete to complete the organization in all cities; and others like Timothy and many others who recognized the apostles as directors in the work, who took oversight of the work like Paul. He did not lord it over them. He left them free while he believed and advocated those great principles of unity of association of all the churches, principles of organization that bound them together as one body through that one spirit that makes many one. And while Paul acted with authority in directing the work, he never interfered with personal lib-

erty or the faith of any one. See 2 Cor. 1:24. "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand."

Matt. 10; Mark 3; Luke 6. Here we have a very significant move on the part of Christ, and it would seem that His soul was greatly burdened, so He continued all night in prayer. Luke 6:12. He had called the attention of His disciples also to the importance of this hour, admonishing them, yea, praying the Lord of the harvest that He should send forth laborers. Matt. 9:38. Now as He continued all night in communion with His Father, He was then ready to enter upon this sacred work. So when it was day He called His disciples and selected twelve from that number (see Luke 6:13), and ordained them. Mark 3. What an example He sets before us and His apostles! What carefulness and cautiousness is manifest in His procedure! He lays the foundation for Paul's instruction, "Lay hands suddenly on no man." ("Desire of Ages," page 291.) And we will see hereafter that these men were chief men, men to whom was submitted difficult questions, and whose decisions were accepted and sent to all the churches.

"Harken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, and God shall be with thee. . . . Provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. And let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge: so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee." Ex. 18:19-22.

This counsel was accepted and not only brought relief to Moses, but resulted in establishing more perfect order among the people; yet rebellion arose against these leaders.

"The Lord had greatly honored Moses, and had wrought wonders by his hand; but the fact that he had been chosen to instruct others did not lead him to conclude that he himself needed no instruction. The chosen

leader of Israel listened gladly to the suggestions of the godly priest of Midian, and adopted his plan as a wise arrangement." "Patriarchs and Prophets," page 301.

We see that every one was not satisfied with these arrangements and principles of law and order in these great movements, both in the Old and New Testaments. "All were not pleased with this decision in the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15); there was a faction of false brethren who assumed to engage in a work on their own responsibility. They indulged in murmuring and fault-finding, proposing new plans and seeking to pull down the work of the experienced men whom God ordained to teach the doctrine of Christ. They church has had such obstacles to meet from the first, and will ever have them to the close of time." "Sketches from Life of Paul," page 71.

We see from the above that the first steps were taken to reorganize the church. "The first step was now to be taken in the organization of the church that after Christ's departure was to be his representative on earth. . . . As in the Old Testament the twelve patriarchs stand as representative of Israel, so the twelve apostles were to stand as representatives of the gospel church." "Desire of Ages," page 291.

We see some things in this very brief outline of the ruling principles of the church, both in the past dispensation and present. Now with this outline before us, we will go back to the beginning and fill in more fully and definitely the evidence of these great principles, and so follow the Master in His outline in Matt. 24 in giving us the signs, and see if we cannot find more incontrovertible evidence of these facts.

In Isa 45:18 we learn that God made this world to be inhabited by that kind of beings that He placed upon it, which were holy and upright beings. In Eccl. 7:29 we find they have sought out many inventions.

Man forfeited his right to the dominion that was given him, and grew worse and worse until God said, "I will destroy him from the earth." Gen. 6:5-13. Then the Lord started the work again, to people the earth and

carry out His original plan and purpose by taking Noah, a preacher of righteousness, whom we see He has reckoned with the special three,—Noah, Daniel, and Job. He was one of the most God-fearing men of earth, and in Gen. 7:1 it is intimated that he was the only righteous one. In a very short time his family and descendants had strayed away so far from God and His true service that it appeared impossible to reclaim them. When His plans seemed to be thwarted in this case, He chose Abraham as third great head of the human race and took him away from his kindred; told him to get out from his country (Gen. 12:1) and He would bless him and make him a blessing to all the nations, and make a great nation of him. This was less than five hundred years after Noah's time.

In Gen. 15:13, God told Abraham that his descendants should be afflicted 400 years; then afterwards they would be called out. It would seem that his descendants understood this matter, as we see by Acts 7:17. "The time of the promise drew nigh."

We see that Abraham's kindred were idolaters and knew not the Lord. The Lord knew that Abraham would command his household after him; and put him through the most severe trial that any human being ever passed, demonstrating his unwavering faith; so the Lord conferred upon him the title of "The Father of the Faithful." The Lord watched over this family with the most tender regard and kept them as the apple of His eye during those long trying years, so as to carry out His original plan. He told them they would be brought into bondage, treated in a cruel way, forced to do hard labor, then in the end of that period He would bring them out. So God had prepared a man by giving him an experience in the king's court where he was educated in all the learning and wisdom of Egypt; then He took him through another course for forty years, training and schooling him until he got rid of every wrong idea and every stain eliminated from his character. Now he was ready to do the work that God had commanded and to walk as He directed, though he felt to shrink, for the task was great, but the

Lord encouraged him. It must now be done. They had come to the close of this prophetic period which God had pointed out; namely, 400 years, so heaven was interested in it and it must be done.

God will not allow His word to fail, and so Moses entered upon his work softly and tremblingly for fear that he might make a mistake. So he raised the cry, "Let my people go." This call rang out louder and louder throughout Egypt, until at last the king suddenly yielded, but against his will. This was for the purpose of giving His people, the light that God had for them, and so they could fulfill and carry out His original plan by giving this great message of truth to the ends of the earth.

Isa. 49:6, they were to give this light to the Gentiles, that was the gospel. Paul says, "The gospel was preached unto us as well as unto them." Heb. 4:2. Jesus says, "I am the light of the world," John 8:12 "as long as I am in the world." John 9:5.

And again He says, "Ye are the light of the world." Matt. 5:14. That is when He left the world.

They were called out so as to be able to keep God's law, especially the Sabbath, for to them "were committed the oracles of God." Rom. 3:2. We learn further in Rom. 9:4 that to them "pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promise." The same as we are required to give the light of the gospel or Third Angel's Message to all the world. God does not change; He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. So He proceeded to organize this great company of people for that work, to give the light of the gospel; the condition of adoption, the law, the promises and the true service, just the same as He requires of us.

Now if you had 3,000,000 people and had a great work to do, what would you do? Would you not organize? And as the work progressed you would add to it instead of diminishing. I believe that God is as wise as man. He was compelled to do this work through weak instruments like ourselves, and He knows these instru-

ments must see visible things even though He tries to teach them to look at the invisible, yet He brings to view many of His workings so all may see and have no excuse. This He did with Israel by adding to their organization from time to time as the occasion seemed to demand.

We see they had their elders early and even before journeying to Egypt. Ex., 3:18. The elders among Israel were ministers themselves, whose words were of some authority among the people even while they were slaves in Egypt. Hence they had some form of government, especially ecclesiastical, heads of tribes and families, teachers and guides. Why go to the elders? Because they were guides and rulers, men of influence, and in authority. The first court of justice was established in the wilderness while they camped at the foot of Mt. Sinai; and this was opened at the suggestion of Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, after he had brought his daughter, Moses' wife, and two sons to the camp of Israel. This was after Jethro had confessed that God was the greatest of all gods and had offered burnt and peace offerings in harmony with Israel. Ex. 18:11-17; 19:22-24-25:

"Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods: for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly he was above them. And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God.

"And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses sat to judge the people: and the people stood by Moses from the morning unto the evening. And when Moses' father-in-law saw all that he did to the people, he said, What is this thing that thou doest to the people? Why sittest thou thyself alone, and all the people stand by thee from morning unto even? And Moses said unto his father-in-law, because the people come unto me to inquire of God: when they have a matter, they come unto me; and I judge between one and another, and I do make them know the statutes of God, and His laws. And Moses' father-in-law said unto him. The thing that thou doest is not good.

"Hearken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel and God shall be with thee. Be thou for the people to God-ward, that thou mayest bring the causes unto God: And thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws, and shalt show them the way wherein they must walk, and the work they must do. Moreover, thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens: And let them judge the people at all seasons: and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge: so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee.\*\*\*\*\*

"So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said. And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens."

So Jethro, after seeing Moses work hard all day from morning to evening, remonstrated and made the above suggestion. And Moses followed the suggestion of his father-in-law and chose able men such as were described, notwithstanding he had the assistance of the elders even before this. Ex. 17:5. The necessity of the cause now called for more help, that they might assist him to administer justice and to teach the people the laws and ordinances and their duties generally. The commission given to these leaders is given in Deut. 1:16, 17. Difficult matters were to be referred to Moses. We see one year after this: (Num. 11:16, 17.)

"And the Lord said unto Moses, gather unto me seventy of the elders of Israel, whom thou **knowest to be elders of the people**, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there; and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone."

Verse 24. "And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people, and set them round about the tabernacle."

Verse 25. "And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass, that when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease."

"Whom he knew to be elders of the people." Evidently those who were faithful and came up to God's requirements of leadership as set forth in Ex. 18-21; 1 Tim. 3:1, 7. These elders sat with the leaders and constituted this high court to assist Moses in judging as well as teaching and instructing the people in regard to their duty to God and to one another. Deut. 27:1; Ex. 18:16. They made the people know the ordinances of God, and they assisted and took part of Moses' work as they had his spirit resting upon them. Num. 11:17. They held counsel meetings (Judges 21:6; 1 Sam. 8:4) and assisted their leader. Deut. 31:9-13. We read of them continually before the captivity. They took a wrong course then, but this is no argument against the Lord's order to have chosen them and thus organized His work for success. This side of the captivity these elders are found in their places, holding counsel with the leaders. Ezra 10:7-8.

"And whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and the elders, all his substance should be confiscated, and himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away."

Then Ezra called upon the people to repent. See v. 11.

Now besides these there were elders that belonged to every city. See Deut. 19:12; 21:3-9. Now Boaz applied to ten men of these elders of the city of Bethlehem. Ruth 4:2, 4, 9. And we read after the captivity of the elders of other cities. Ezra 10:1. This court was held at the gate of the city. Ruth 4:1; Deut. 16:18. The



Scriptures give a full description of this court in Deut. 17:8-13. They came unto the priest, Levites and to the judge. The leader, presiding officer, or whoever may be at the head in this city of other affairs was president of the court. This ordinance was neglected for a time as they became idolatrous, and we find Jehosaphat restoring it at the same time as he did the courts in every city. 2 Chron. 19:8, 11.

"Moreover in Jerusalem did Jehosaphat set of the Levites, and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies, when they returned to Jerusalem. And he charged them, saying, Thus shall ye do in the fear of the Lord, faithfully and with a perfect heart. And what cause soever shall come to you of your brethren that dwell in their cities, between blood and blood, between law and commandment, statutes and judgments, ye shall even warn them that they trespass not against the Lord, and so wrath come upon you, and upon your brethren: this do, and ye shall not trespass."

We see now that their duty was to warn the people and give them instruction concerning their obligations. We see that Jehosaphat had sought the Lord and he was a reformer as stated in 2 Chron. 17:5-9: hence he restored those things that had been lost sight of. This is about six hundred years after Moses' time, and here he recognized two courts, one over the city and the other an ecclesiastical court. See verse 11.

"And behold, Amariah the chief priest is over you in all matters of the Lord; and Zebadiah the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, for all the king's matters; also the Levites shall be officers before you. Deal courageously, and the Lord shall be with thee for good."

Now you see the chief priest was over them for all matters of the Lord; and Zebadiah ruler of the house of Judah for all the king's business. For the spiritual or ecclesiastical questions, the high priest sat as the chief judge; if it was otherwise, it was the chief justice that sat in behalf of the king or city. This council, at the re-

turn of the captivity, was restored with the rest of the commonwealth, as the prophet Ezekiel has expressed it. Eze. 44:23, 24. We see the form of the intermediary who presented all these cases brought before this court as given in Jer. 26:8-10. It is thought by some where matters partook of the nature of both the ecclesiastical and civil, temporal and spiritual, that the judges in each of these faculties sat to hear the case, but where it was simply of a purely temporal character, the supreme judge sat with the princes, elders, and scribes, who were doctors of the law, to hear the case. We have some evidence of this in Jer. 26:8. The priests condemned him to death, but when the princes came up from the king's court at the entry of the new gate, the place where they held their court, these priests told them their verdict. Verse 10. But we see this other court did not agree with them. Verse 16—read the whole chapter. Deut. 19 tells us that the judges shall make diligent search for facts.

“The travels of the children of Israel are faithfully described, the deliverance which the Lord wrought for them, their perfect organization and special order, their sin in murmuring against Moses and thus against God, their transgressions, their rebellions, their punishments, their carcasses strewn in the wilderness because of their unwillingness to submit to God's wise arrangements,—this faithful picture is hung up before us as a warning lest we follow their example of disobedience, and fall like them.

“‘Now all these things happened unto them for examples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.’ Has God changed from a God of order? No; he is the same in the present dispensation as in the former. Paul says, ‘God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.’ He is as particular now as then. And He designs that we should learn lessons of order and organization from the perfect order instituted in the days of Moses, for the benefit of the children of Israel.” “Test. for the

Church," Vol. 1, pages, 652, 653.

These eight points giving us a faithful picture of a divine system of organization are the very things that Eld. Jones says excludes the Christian Order.

But we see the eight points set out as a picture and hung up before us that we may take heed as a people to all these things. Organization is one of them. All these things are "ensamples," as above quoted. Ensamples, type, similitudes, similar, closely resembling, yet not always the very image. Heb. 10:1. This organization included both church and state; the organization of this theocracy included both the civil and the ecclesiastical, the main part of it in both. The penalties were different; the death penalty,—stoning, etc. was the penalty of the civil law. If not, it would follow that those who suffered death by stoning would not die the second death; and we all know that when they were stoned to death for sin as a penalty of the civil law that would not excuse them from the penalty of the moral government of God. It is the ecclesiastical part of this government that is the type; it is that part that is referred to the church. 2 Chron. 19:11. In the case of Jehoshaphat, he was a reformer, restoring the original principles, both in the civil and ecclesiastical commonwealth. "Amariah the high priest is over you in all matters of the Lord (that is the ecclesiastical part of this theocracy) "and Zebediah, the son of Ishmael, ruler of the house of Judah, for all the king's matters." (The civil part.)

You will notice that this word elder as brought to view in Peter 5:1 may also mean apostle; he declares that he was also an elder.

We have a brief outline of the names and officers of the church in the wilderness. We have a church spoken of in the 18th chapter of Matthew in the 17th verse, but there is nothing said, at this time, in regard to the officers, elders, or rulers of the church. Now we have come down to another period of the world which was brought to view in the prophecy of Daniel, the 9th chapter, setting forth a period of sixty-nine weeks that was to bring us to the Messiah. The world had gone to its lowest

depth of sin, and it looked as though this light God had given was almost extinguished, notwithstanding that God had committed this light to this special family of Abraham, the faithful man of God. Coming now to the close of another prophetic period, when there must be something done; the Word was now made Flesh and dwelt among men. So the work of calling out His people commenced once more, and we see that He that declared He was "the light of the world" said, "It is fulfilled. The kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel." Mark 1:15.

So this was the fulfillment of those sixty-nine weeks, and the time for another special work to be done, to give additional light upon the gospel, lest it might be entirely extinguished from the earth. So now this work was commenced right at the proper time and we see that it was necessary that this church called out should be organized in order to carry on this great work as it was with the church in the wilderness. While we have nothing said in reference to the appointment of the first elders of the church, we have a very definite record where He called the twelve apostles and sent them out into the field to carry forward this work.

"The first step was now to be taken in the organization of the church that after Christ's departure was to be his representative on earth. . . . As in the Old Testament the twelve patriarchs stand as representatives of Israel, so the twelve apostles were to stand as representatives of the gospel church." "Desire of Ages," page 291.

We have also the seventy that were called and sent out. In this we see that the form of the organization was recognized by the work that was here done. Back there the twelve patriarchs and seventy elders, here the twelve apostles and the seventy sent out. As Peter had said that an apostle was an elder, so we have in this the recognition of elders in the apostles. Now as time went on and followers were added to the church, as brought to view here in the first chapters of Acts, we find that it was necessary to add further officers to the church as

set forth in the 6th chapter of Acts and the third verse.

"Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom ye may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word."

The apostles were the rulers, chief or head men, the same as Moses was, and his elders.

Verse 5. "And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost . . . ."

Now it appears from this that there was a committee appointed to look out seven men; these men were to have the same characteristics as you see brought to view in Exodus, men who feared God, who hated covetousness, full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom. And this committee, whether of one or five or seven, or even a committee of the whole of that multitude consisting of many thousands,—and if so they must have had them called all together and taken some action—but there is nothing more reasonable in the world than that they chose out of that number men whom they saw had good sense and judgment to constitute a committee to look them out. They brought them and set them before the apostles. You see in verse 5 that they chose Stephen, et cetera, which is just as properly translated, they elected Stephen, et cetera, as elected is one of the definitions given by our best lexicographers of the word chosen, and chosen is also one of the definitions given for elect. Campbell, McKnight, and Sawyer have translated this word "chosen," elected. So they had a committee to look out, whether many or few, who constituted a nominating committee, and then the election followed. This seems to be the form set forth of electing officers of the church according to this New Testament order. It seems to me, that we as a people are not far away from the order here brought to view, and this is also the way Moses did.

We see what Paul to Timothy said concerning these officers, 1 Tim. 3:2:

"A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one

wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless."

Now we see from this that the elder must necessarily have certain moral qualifications, and also have the gift of teaching as well, and to have also a gift of ruling or directing the work of the church of God. We see that in some sense all elders are really rulers just the same as that brought to view in the church in the wilderness. I Tim. 5:17, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor." 1 Thess. 5:12.

"And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you."

Now we turn to Romans 12:6: "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministry; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness."

So you see that we have the idea clearly brought to view, among the gifts, the gift of governing or directing or piloting the church over which the elder is placed as an overseer, is that they may not injure their craft. Yet while this is so, they are admonished to—

"Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away. Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility."

We see from this that they are strictly admonished not to "lord" it over God's heritage. They are to be examples worthy of imitation; they are to be under-shepherds, having the same care, manifesting the same spirit that the chief Shepherd has manifested to His children. The younger are to be subject to the older. This being subject is not subject in the sense that they are slaves, but it is subject in the sense in which every one of us are subject one to another, or should be. Now while the elder is to be ruler as Moses's elders over the church in the wilderness, and to have the gift of teaching, and also the gift of directing in the ecclesiastical affairs of the church of God, we see that God's order is just the same as some term "the old Mosaic order," which they declare has passed away. See "Appeal," page 36. (A. T. Jones No. 2.)

"But to go back to the Mosaic order was, in itself, and at one plunge, the total abandonment of the Christian order."

We will call your attention again to Vol. 1, page 649, and simply quote here a few items as we have already quoted this in full, so you will see in connection with our present development of the subject what is said here.

"Ministers should discipline the church of God and teach them to work harmoniously, like a well-drilled company of soldiers. \* \* \* Angels work harmoniously perfect order characterizes all their movements in angels who are thoroughly organized, moving in perfect order, work successfully."

Page 650. "I was pointed back to the children of Israel. Very soon after leaving Egypt they were thor-

oughly organized and disciplined. The travels of the children of Israel are faithfully described; the deliverance which the Lord wrought for them, their perfect organization and special order, their sin in murmuring against Moses and thus against God, their transgressions, their rebellions, their punishments, their carcasses strewn in the wilderness, because of their unwillingness to submit to God's wise arrangements,—this faithful picture is hung up before us, as a warning lest we follow their example of disobedience, and fall like them."

Mark this point. It is a picture or type, you notice, that God's wise arrangements are here spoken of as one of the things to which they were not willing to submit. One of these things was organization, and we see in reading that they rebelled against it by rebelling against Moses. We find Paul calling attention to this very same thing in 1 Cor. the 10th chapter, as a type or picture that should be considered by us upon whom the ends of the world are come. It looks to me that these authors all agree. The New Testament brings to view rulers, governors, officers just the same as brought to view in the Old Testament. It recognizes that the committees of nominations and elections and delegates are set forth in the New Testament very clearly. We have already spoken of elections, now we call your attention to the 15th chapter of Acts, the 2nd verse. The question or dispute down at Antioch was the subject under discussion and they decided to have Paul and Barnabas and some others of the church (appointed these men as representatives) at Antioch come up to Jerusalem and see the apostles about this question, indicating that they were men of authority. So we see in the 6th verse that the apostles and elders came together to consider this matter in connection with those delegates that came up from Antioch; and there is some evidence that there were delegates from other churches present. This shows that they held council meetings; and it is proper and right for the church to appoint delegates to attend such meetings. It also appears in this connection that James was the chairman or president of this council.



We see here in Acts, chapters 1, 6, 14, and 15, the great principle of procedure of all well-organized and disciplined bodies or churches, and that was after the order of the church in the wilderness. They both added as necessity demanded to the organization. We also see in Acts, the 15th chapter, where they had their headquarters and held their councils there, organized this conference with these delegates. Their chief men, apostles, committees, members, elders, etc., men of authority and influence to whom was referred all difficult questions that pertained to the prosperity of the church. Decisions of this body were respected and carried to all the churches by such men as Paul and Barnabas and two others, chief men of the brethren, chapter 15:22, both of them being prophets, chosen or elected by this representative body, verse 22, who having authority sent these men on a missionary tour to Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, verse 23, to deliver this sentence or decree, verse 19, which James being chairman gave, in which they all united, apostles, elders, and the brethren, this included those visiting brethren—delegates—who voted on this sentence, which was shown in the letters which expressed that decision, as they desired all these churches in different parts of the country should harmonize, teach, and believe, and be established in the faith. See chapter 16:5. This official statement was submitted in writing so they could not get wrong.

Now then, Paul and Barnabas, and these other two brethren, Judah and Silas, went back to Antioch, chapter 15:25-27. They gathered the multitude and delivered the epistle to them, verse 30. Judah and Silas also exhorted the brethren with many words, verse 32. So Paul and Silas went throughout all the places where Paul and Barnabas had been, and delivered the decrees which they were to keep which were ordained by the apostles and elders and (delegates) which were at Jerusalem. And so the churches were established in the faith. Chapter 16:4, 5.

So all recognized the authority of the apostles and elders, and Paul with the rest recognized them; at least he went where he was told to go to Antioch, Syria and

Cilicia, and preached what he was told to preach, which was set forth in this decree, etc. So we see that the elders in the gospel time sustained the same relation to the church as in the past dispensation. They must have the same spiritual and moral qualifications, with the same gifts, apt to teach, rule or take care of the church just as a good Christian father rules his family. See Eph. 5:23.

"For the husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church," and no more; and as the church is subject to Christ so is the wife subject to her husband, and no more, but not to be lorded over. 1 Peter 5:3. The husband—father—takes the lead and carries the great burden; just so with the elders, the under shepherds.

James, who seemed to be chairman of this council, is spoken of by Paul as one of the pillars. Gal. 2:9. He and John and Cephas are referred to as being leaders among the apostles, who are spoken of in Ephesians 2:20 with the prophets as the foundation of this building, Christ the chief corner-stone. The apostles come first. These three men stand next to the chief corner-stone, hence leaders.

Now we have here a very brief outline of what we may do on similar occasions. I am quite sure that our conferences follow quite closely this outline, and am sure they do not go beyond it, neither in what they do, nor in assuming authority, that would interfere with individual liberty of any laborer who has any desire to harmonize in the organization unless he is determined to lead at all hazards and so strike off independently, crying "Pope-dom."

"All the efforts made to establish order are considered dangerous, a restriction of rightful liberty, and hence are feared as **popery**. These deceived souls consider it a virtue to boast of their freedom to think and act independently. They will not take any man's say so. They are amenable to no man. I was shown that it is Satan's special work to lead men to feel that it is God's order for them to strike out for themselves, and choose

their own course, independent of their brethren." Vol. 1, page 650.

Paul (Titus 1:5) appointed Titus to do a certain work,—ordain elders in every city. Appointed him, then sent him, told him what to do,—ordain elders in every city—then told him what to preach at these places. See chapter 2. Then told him how to do it, verse 15. Paul, who received his credentials from God, which he presented to the council at Jerusalem and which they recognized and so invested him with full ecclesiastical authority by ordaining him to the ministry.

"God foresaw the difficulties, that their credentials would be questioned, and in His wise providence caused them to be invested with unquestionable authority from the established church of God." "Life Sketches of Paul," page 42.

"The Redeemer of the World does not sanction experience and exercise in religious matters independent of His organized and acknowledged church. Many have an idea that they are responsible to Christ alone for their light and experience, independent of His recognized followers on earth. But in the history of the conversion of Saul, important principles are given us, which we should ever bear in mind. He was brought directly into the presence of Christ. \* \* \* He arrested his course and converted him; but when asked by him, "What wilt thou have me to do?" the Saviour placed him in connection with His church, and let them direct him what to do. \* \* \* In this case Ananias represents Christ, and also represents Christ's ministers upon earth, who are appointed to act in His stead. \* \* \* All is done in the name and by the authority of Christ; but the church is the channel of communication." "Sketches from the Life of Paul," pages 31, 32.

In 1 Cor. 12:4. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit \* \* \* the spirit is given to every man to profit withal." "It lighteth every man who cometh into the world." John 1:9.

"The same spirit gives to one the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, \* \* \* to another

faith, by the same spirit, to another the gift of healing, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another divers kinds of tongues, to another interpretation of tongues, but all these worketh that one and the selfsame spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will."

Verse 28. "And God set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." See also Eph. 4:11.

If we want an elder we are told what kind of a man to choose, to appoint, or elect. Not a novice, but one who has had some experience and has the gift of teaching and directing, and God says that He has set such in the church, and he must have these other qualifications that belong to elders. We cannot, by election, cause them to possess these gifts nor give them these qualifications; they are in the church and it is for us to look them out. The same is true of deacons or helpers, etc. If we wish a teacher in the college, we cannot make one by elections; they must have the gift and the experience or preparation, so if we cannot find one here at College View we will look over to Washington or California or some other place until we find one. It is so if we want an apostle, as there is but little difference from that of an elder (see Peter 5:1). Peter says he is also an elder. Neither can they be made by election, and if we have a number of them and if it is necessary to fill that place, we will choose one. See Acts 1:23. They had two. Asking the Lord to guide them, they cast lots; both of these men had the qualifications. This is the same in principle as balloting or voting. If we trust the Lord to guide then His choice will be our choice, as in the case of choosing Saul, His anointed. 1 Sam. 10:24. "See him whom the Lord hath chosen." We see in this case that the people were guided in the choice of this king. The Lord must be left free where all may know His will. 1 Sam. 12:13—"Behold the king whom ye have chosen." Both the people and God had a hand in choosing this king.

The church at Jerusalem chose and sent two of their

prophets with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch to help do a certain work. Acts 15:22, 32. So we may choose or elect prophets and send them (the General Conference sent Mrs. White to Australia), but remember, we cannot make one by election; the Lord sets them in the church just the same as teachers.

Now we go back to one gift that is spoken of as governments. What does this mean? It is said that we are a royal priesthood, a holy nation. 1 Pet. 2:9. The very same thing is said of Israel. Why should we not have governments or governors? What does that word mean? Campbell, McKnight, and Wilson, in their translations, give it directors. The Revised Version translates it "wise counsellors." Liddle and Scott define this word "good steering, directing,"—a pilot's art. Now we have many directors or governors in the church, so when we want a president for any part of our work just look out among the multitude for a director, steersman, or governor. They are in the church; God set them there to help along the work. This organization and the one in the wilderness surely are very much alike.

Now we see the last calling out at the end of another prophetic period; namely, the 2300 days, 1844. So our God had His men ready, Miller in the United States, Wolfe in Asia, and others raised the cry, "Time is fulfilled. Time shall be no longer. Fear God and give glory to Him for the hour of His judgment is come."

In four of these last long chains of prophecy,—the seven churches, seven seals, seven trumpets, and the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters of Revelation,—this message is set forth and a large place given to describe it; and the last sign which is the message to the ends of the earth is almost finished. There is another long chain of prophecy given as the foundation of this movement, Dan. 8 and 9. While not one of the other seven or eight long chains covering the entire gospel period but what gives room for this message and is not incompatible in the least with it. There was a religious wave that swept over the country at that time which stirred the religious world from center to circumference,

and was carried to all corners of the earth. An English writer is quoted as saying that "300 ministers are preaching it in America, 700 in Great Britain, Doctor Wolfe and others in Asia." So it is quite certain that this movement was carried into every land, showing a divine hand guiding it all over. Although it moves slowly it moves surely, like God's operations everywhere. Nothing can stop it—on it goes gloriously.

I further prove organization by its authority being recognized in the churches and its officers. A congregation or an association with officers exercising authority proves organization; and if that organization is built after the pattern given by the great Organizer or head and exercises that authority and no more than was delegated to it, then whatever it does has the endorsement of the head or organizer, even though man does it and it might be called man made machinery.

The tabernacle was built by man and so it was man-made (Heb. 8), but was made after a pattern. Now if the church is organized after the pattern given by the great Organizer with that authority given and no more, will He not endorse its organization and its work? He will unless he goes back on His own instruction. Now, inasmuch as He has appointed men to do His work, evidently we will find Him referring parties to His agent or representative for information because that party is located within our reach and has the instructions from the firm in plain, explicit language, and we have access to it and so there can be no mistake. His agent does not go beyond His instruction, for he has no power of his own to make good his promises.

Christ recognized that what this church does is right because it followed His orders. This organization is no more man-made than was the earthly tabernacle. We see the reasons the Lord must endorse this. Whatever is bound on earth is bound in heaven. Matt. 18:18. Paul was directed to the church for instruction (Acts 9:6), and so was Cornelius (Acts 10:20-43). These texts all show that He recognized His church, His representative on earth, and so points the inquiring parties to it for

information. This is His ordinary way of doing, and using men instead of angels.

Neither did the great Head of the Church just impress them by His Spirit and leave them with that alone with a possibility of misunderstanding it, but sent them to His recognized representatives to give them in unmistakable language the proper instruction. In Paul's case: "What wilt thou have me to do?" "Arise, and go into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do." The same is true of Cornelius: Call Peter "and he will speak words to thee." Why did not the Lord tell him right there what to do? Because He had His established way and plan of doing His work. So Paul went up to the city and stayed with the disciple and Ananias preached to him and he was baptized (Vs. 18, 19). Everyone must admit where authority is recognized as existing in a body of people or its officers proves some kind of an organization. They may with a disposition to usurp power go beyond their legitimate authority, like Moses, who misapprehended the measure of his rulership when he slew the Egyptian. Hence we see he assumed popish authority and it took forty years to overcome it before God could trust him to rule His people (Acts 7:25, 27, 37).

If God's original plan was good, why not stay with it? If He was a man like one of us He would change perhaps and make a better one as we do when we learn by experience and become wiser. But God changes not. He takes the best way, the best plan, right at the first. Hence His plans under Christ are just the same as under Moses—to give the gospel to the world. And the first thing Moses did was to organize and put men in authority at the head of divisions. So we will expect, unless God changes, that Christ will commence in the same way if it was God's plan to have it so done at first.

First, He chose the twelve apostles to stand as representatives of the gospel church, the same as the twelve patriarchs. Then He chose the seventy, sent them out as He did the twelve, pointing out their duty and warning them of their dangers.

"Christ designs that heaven's order, heaven's plan of

government, heaven's divine harmony, shall be represented in His church." "Desire of Ages," p. 680. The life of Christ that gives life to the world is in His word. He knew the character of these whom He called. He told them they were to believe His word and act on His teachings, and all who would receive Him He would give power to become sons of God and those would partake of His nature and be conformed to His character. His words were calculated to test their faith. So He was training them for their great responsibility to occupy a chief place, a place of authority in the church. The foundation stones were to be in close proximity to the chief corner-stone of the great building.

As we have said, God has His way of doing. His ordinary way and His special way. His ordinary movements and His special movements. We have seen how He has worked in those special movements, having that special work that must be done at that time. Hence He makes special preparation. He sends out special calls to special men who fit in the best possible way the needs of that work. Then the man that will answer that call He puts in training, and if he stands the tests and discipline of that school he is ready for the work, if not He takes someone else that He can trust to be faithful and loyal to His work.

God has not changed since the days of Moses. The great principles of His government are the same. The law is the same and the gospel is the same, and if He had anything to do in choosing the plan or method in doing that work why should it not be the same as God always takes—the best plan first of all, as He does not have to experiment. Then Moses' plan was the right one. But hear A. T. Jones No. 2: "But so long as I believe in Christ instead of Moses and in the Christian Order instead of the Mosaic Order, and so long as the S. D. A. denomination holds to Moses and the Mosaic Order, this antagonism cannot be prevented."

The world is too wise to attempt anything without organization. Think of a railroad system undertaking to run without organization!



Christ called the twelve apostles, also the seventy, as we have already observed, and sent them out, observing the Mosaic Order very definitely, but He did not say anything about deacons, neither did He command these apostles to go throughout all the churches and appoint elders, but left them to their own good sense and the surrounding circumstances with the Spirit of God as their guide to complete this organization as circumstances might demand and take in the lessons as set forth by Moses, the type of Christ and Christ the great Head of the church.

The apostles recognized the importance of organization as set forth by these leaders, so they took it and went on with it by helping to select deacons, Acts 6, Acts 14:23, and thus "set in order" (Titus 1:5), that is, completed the organization, and did their part of it, ordained the elders. The church was to do its part by choosing or election (2 Cor. 8:19; Acts 6:5).

God has a part in this choosing if we will let Him have it. See 1 Sam. 10:24: "See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen." 1 Sam. 12:13: "Behold the king whom ye have chosen." Then the officers elected are ordained by men in authority in the church. Did the church abandon the Christian Order by choosing deacons? Did the apostles repudiate Christ by ordaining them? Yea, did they not follow on closely to the Mosaic Order?

We have seen that Moses heeded the wise suggestion of Jethro, his father-in-law, a man of experience, and these officers were all men of authority after they had been chosen, and not before. "Take able men, such as fear God; men of truth, and place such over them to be rulers of thousands," etc., etc. Ex. 18:21. These are called captains by Moses. Deut 1:13, 15. "Take you wise men \* \* \*" (v. 14). "The people said, the thing which thou has spoken is good." So you see they accepted it (v. 15). "So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men and known, and made them heads over you and captains over thousands," etc. (See Num. 14:4.) To show what the word captain means see Deut. 20:9, "Make captains of the armies to lead the people."

These terms show authority and all admit these terms

and their meaning. Now turn to the Christian Order. See the same terms: elders, rulers, placed over you. 1 Tim. 5:17: "Let the elders that rule well," etc. "He that ruleth with diligence." Rom. 12:8. "For if a man know not how to rule his own house how shall he take care of the church of God?" In this case the elder takes the place of the head of the family with authority, not as a great lord but as an affectionate, kind and noble ruler as Abraham, who commanded his household after him. We are called on to esteem those who are over us in the Lord very highly for their works' sake. Count them worthy of double honor. 1 Tim. 5:17.

The very fact that a person is chosen or elected by others to do a work carries with it authority to do the work. The power or authority is delegated by the parties choosing. He is not simply doing his own work or duty, but more than that. There is in the business world such a thing recognized as delegating to another power or authority to deed away your home, and all he needs to do is to show that he was chosen for that purpose, and by this act of accepting such authority it adds to his own personal duty a duty to be fulfilled for others and so enlarges or increases his duties.

God recognizes the great principle of the right of His people to have a voice as to who shall serve as leader. This we have seen in the choosing of King Saul. It is further manifested in choosing the one to take Judas' place. The disciples gave God a free hand to help in choosing this man, but he was not numbered with the eleven till after the people had acted their part, and this act gave him the full authority of an apostle. The same is true of the seven deacons in Acts 6th. The great mass agreed on these seven men and so they were chosen or elected. This authority was given them to distribute these gifts properly by being elected for that purpose.

No one dare claim that they had that authority before they received it by this church election.

The church at Antioch determined or decided to have Paul, Barnabas, and others go up to Jerusalem to see the apostles and elders about that question (Acts 15:2). But

why must they see the apostles and elders? Because they were the chief men of the church (Acts 15:22). Not simply of Jerusalem but of all the churches whose authority, included Antioch, etc. If not, why did they not settle it there? They had prophets there. Could not God have spoken through one of them? Acts 13:7. But God recognized His own organization by sending these delegates up to Jerusalem to these chief men (this was His way in the days of Moses also), men of authority, and we see the church received them (v. 4), not only the church but the apostles and elders. It was not enough to say the church received them, but it added the apostles and elders, men in authority. Then all of these agree apostles, elders, and the church to choose men of their own company to go, which was to all intents and purposes an election. It makes no difference how it was carried on, whether it was holding up the right or the left hand. As there were at least 10,000 to 15,000 people, evidently the most satisfactory, feasible and expeditious way was taken. So this great company, apostles, elders and brethren, sent these chosen men, Judas and Silas, with Paul and Barnabas to deliver this special message.

These two apostles were delegated with authority from the church at Jerusalem with Paul and Barnabas to do that special work at that special time. So their words would be an official statement, words of authority. Acts 15:34. Where Paul and Barnabas had been they delivered these decrees for those churches to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders, or to use our more common and everyday terms, delivered to them the recommendations passed by the General Conference in session, the churches were established in the faith (Acts 16:5), and there was a union of sentiment and harmony on these points among all the churches. To this end Paul labored.

Paul, who in after years had the care of all the churches (2 Cor. 11:28), sent other laborers to work among the churches, and they recognized Paul's relation to the work and they willingly conformed to his requests. (See Titus 1:5). "For this cause I left thee in Crete to

set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city."

He told him to hold fast the faithful word as he had been taught that he might by sound doctrine both exhort and convince the gainsayer. Then told him that there were a lot of unruly talkers whose mouths must be stopped (vs. 10, 11), told him to rebuke them sharply; he was also to exhort servants to be obedient to their masters. "These things speak and exhort and rebuke with all authority" (v. 15).

Paul further says: "I have sent a brother with Titus to you whose praise is throughout all the churches and not that only, but who was also **chosen by the churches** to travel with us." The Twentieth Century translation says, "was elected by the churches." So we see the churches had something to say what men should do and where men should go. This all shows they recognized authority in the churches over the individuals. And they all recognized Christ as the head over all,—Christ, the Chief Shepherd, Chief Captain, Chief Prince, Leader, and Head over all His hosts, with His undershepherds and officers all perfect and complete.

It is evident that God has chosen some to perform a specific work or office in the church (1 Cor. 12:28). "Inasmuch as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify mine office." What does the word office mean? That which is laid upon or taken up, by one person to perform for another. A special duty, trust, or charge conferred by authority: as the office of priest in the Old Testament, and apostles in the New Testament. The elder is represented as an undershepherd called to feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint but willingly, neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock. It is not enough to feed the church and be examples to them, but they are to be the overseers of the flock. That means not only that he should overlook, inspect, superintend the work of the church, but is held responsible to see that it is kept alive and active in his Master's work, and will be held responsible for the faithful discharge of their solemn duties (Heb. 13:17).

John 10:2, 4, 11, shows what the good Shepherd will do for His flock. Then in turn the true church will show its regard for its faithful officers by counting them worthy of double honor (1 Tim. 5:17). The one who rules well is one who is faithful in following the instructions of the Chief Shepherd. We are to obey them who have rule over us, and submit ourselves, for they watch for our souls as they that must give an account (Heb. 13:17), with honor and responsibility borne. We further see authority invested in the church by power to excommunicate and discipline. We have found there were to be rulers and governors in the church, and we see how they were to govern the church.

Paul says: "We have confidence that ye will do the things we command you." 2 Thess. 3:46. Now what does he command? "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the traditions received from us." 2 Thess. 3. Note that man and have no company with him (v. 14). The revised version Campbell and McNight, Dean Alford, Sawyer, all agree in our translation. Does that mean that you must not walk with him up the street or sit in church with him or ride on the cars with him? How can we withdraw? Ask any society or association, they can tell you. But Paul will give us the unmistakable meaning of this term, "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators. Yet not altogether with fornicators of this world or with the covetous or extortioners or idolaters for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep [church] company with any man that is called a brother by a fornicator," etc., etc., "with such a one we are not to eat the Lord's supper. \* \* \* Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." 1. Cor. 5:9, 10, 11, 13. All the above translators agree in these texts, while Sawyer says, "Remove therefore the evil man from among you." This proves an organized society with authority to expel from its association or company. "Mark them who cause division and offenses con-

trary to the doctrines which ye have learned and avoid them." Rom. 16:17.

Revised version says, "Turn away from them." Paul again says, "A man who is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject." Titus 3:10. Also Paul wished that those Judaizing teachers who troubled the Galatian brethren were cut off. Gal. 5:12. These were the fellows that Paul gave no place by subjection for an hour. Gal. 2:5. He surely would not have opened the church and gave it to them for weeks.

Do we want any more evidence that a perfect organization is recognized and a union of association of all the churches than is set forth in these texts, with authority to receive and expel members and hence a standard by which they determine the worthy from the unworthy?

Matt. 18:15 ought to settle the whole question, Who is a brother? Any man in the town? Will you dare say yes? Then I will take two or three of the town people of the town board. Then if he will not hear hear them I will tell it to the people of the town. How can I do that? Call the town board and get them to call a mass meeting.

If this text referred to the church in heaven how could I tell it to the church there and get them to call a mass meeting? And then if he would not hear them let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. These inconsistencies with many others must arise if God has no visible church organization on the earth with authority to change the relationship of that member to that organization. If it is in heaven only, then we will have nothing at all to do or say what his future relation shall be to the church. The Lord will tend to that. He has himself changed his relationship by his own act, perhaps by preaching the resurrection part, or some other false doctrine, and so we just recognize it by obeying Paul.

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one." John 17:20. "Be of good comfort, be of one mind." 2 Cor. 13:11. "I beseech you

\* \* \* that ye all speak the same thing \* \* \*  
be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the

same judgment." Cor. 1:16. Now how can this prayer be carried out unless all the churches agree together both in theory and practice in a union of associations, perfect union even as Christ and the Father are in? The extremist may call it federation, but you and I will call it Christian harmony, where the brethren dwell together in unity, having the same mind, speaking the same things.

Christ well knew if every individual in one single church would unite with Him, the Head of the church, that that church would be in perfect harmony among themselves, and if the congregations were thus unified there would be perfect union of action in sentiment and judgment, speaking the same things throughout.

But He also knew that after His departure grievous wolves would enter in and turn away many from the truth and turn them unto fables. So it was necessary to give His church instruction what to do in such cases as we have here stated.

Shall we repudiate Sabbath Schools because we cannot find where they had them in the early church? With these examples before us of organization in both the Old and New Testament to carry on the work of God in the earth, we have no hesitancy in drawing our conclusion that it is right to organize our Sabbath Schools, our young people's work, both in our churches, at our home, and at camp meeting, with teachers and superintendents to take the lead and direct the work to the best advantage to forward the work, and to organize our schools, great and small, into classes with leaders or teachers with authority to direct, control and discipline according to the great gospel principles and their best judgment, guided by the Holy Spirit.

It would be worse than nonsense to adopt the above in these different departments of the church work and repudiate these same principles in the church itself.

We can not have a camp meeting without organization, a leader, one in authority, no, not even a Bible class, a meeting of any kind. Someone has to assume the authority as leader. If one is not elected, we always elect a chairman to take the lead and direct a meeting of any

kind. "Submit one to another." Can we do this and Christ lead: Christ as Head over all? Christ sent the disciples out just as He was sent. So these disciples recognized the great Leader by following Him in organization. The minister who sends an appointment takes charge of the assembly, and we conform to his wish and submit to his orders as a well-disciplined assembly. We stand and sing or pray and adjourn and go home, and in every move recognize his authority.

Now we have appealed to the Scriptures to show that there is organization with authority in small companies and large bodies, with their elders to direct, superintend and take the lead in teaching, instructing and disciplining the flocks over which they have been placed as overseers and to be examples in all good works. Then further like Israel, there are wheels within the wheels; organization within organization, like the angelic hosts or an army. This is seen in Paul's experience in Acts 15, where he recognized authority of the chief men; also in the cases where he recognized the authority of the churches to cut off or suspend members, and in all the churches choosing men to do general work outside of their own borders as in 2 Cor. 8:19.

With these things established by the Scriptures we appeal to the Testimonies to show a perfect harmony with the Bible and good sense as all divine revelation harmonizes with the highest and best of common sense.

I have already referred to the Testimonies. Now I want to call special attention to the following significant facts which prove to my mind that no person in his right mind would dare to risk his intelligence before the public and claim to believe the Testimonies and still repudiate organization as here set forth.

When Paul and Barnabas were formally ordained they were "invested with full ecclesiastical authority." "Life Sketches," p. 42. "Caused them to be invested with unquestionable authority from the established church of God." This has been published, believed and preached for thirty years. "When trouble arises between brethren the Savior's rule should be strictly followed. All possible



effort should be made to effect a reconciliation, but if the parties stubbornly persist in remaining at variance they should be suspended till they can harmonize." "Testimony No. 31," p. 237. This was published thirty-one years ago. "If the Captain's orders in the rule given for the erring have been strictly followed, then an advance step is to be taken. Tell it to the church and let action be taken in the case according to the Scriptures. Then it is that heaven will ratify the decision made by the church in cutting off the offending member if he does not repent." "Test. No. 33," p. 145. This was published twenty-five years ago.

We have referred to what Paul said to the Galatians, "I would that they were even cut off which trouble you." "Paul sought to expose and correct these errors. He greatly desired that these false teachers might be separated from the church, but their influence had affected so many of the believers that it seemed hazardous to take action against them." "Test. No. 31," p. 239. All these Scriptures and Testimonies unite in declaring that the church on this earth (not in the air), an organized body, was invested with authority and has power or authority to withdraw from members who walk disorderly. I venture the assertion that this is the first impression given to every reader of these evidences, and it will take a whole lot of explanation and interpretation with a mixed-up conglomeration of arguments to eradicate this first impression.

Authority is further recognized by the way of deciding who shall be selected as leaders. We have seen that the people acted their part by choosing a king (1 Sam. 12:13), and the church at Jerusalem in choosing their officers (Acts 6:3, 5).

"After a suitable trial some one should be selected by the voice of the church to be the acknowledged leader, never, however, to be chosen for more than one year. Then another may be selected or the same one may be elected if his services have proved a blessing to the church." "Test. No. 33," p. 147. And the minister then acts his part by ordaining the one chosen (Titus 1:5).

"The same principle should be followed in selecting men for other responsible positions, as in the offices of the conference. Untried men should not be elected as presidents of conferences." "Test. No. 33," p. 147.

These facts all unite in declaring that the church referred to is an organization, a systematic union of individuals in a body with officers, leaders, elders, or directors and lay members working together with one purpose, to one common end, with authority to receive into the fold those who accept from the heart the doctrines of Christ, and to withdraw from such as apostatize from His doctrines.

This last move is just the same thing over, but under another cover. Great liberty is preached. They have no use for any visible organization and hence have no use for any standard of membership or discipline to belong to such an organization, just believe and do whatever you please and you will not be called to have your work considered by any body of believers, whether it comes to the standard that Christ laid down or not. Paul commanded us "to withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." 2 Thess. 3:6. They do not need any of this discipline or restraint imposed on them, "their wisdom is a sufficient guide," because each and all of them are connected with the great Head "and so it is not possible for them to err," and so doubts are insinuated concerning the laws or rules of church procedure and they say "now if we can get all the S. D. A.'s to see this, then great good would accrue to the entire host, for the object is to secure freedom for all [see "Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 37] from this man-made machinery. Just never mind, the Lord will tend to His church members."

Reader, do not be deceived by these smooth insinuations. Remember, "there was one who perverted the freedom that God had granted to His creatures." Now do they believe in any kind of machinery, and visible, tangible machinery? They say they do not believe in man-made machinery, but do they believe in a machinery made and patterned after the pattern or model that the Lord

has given? Do they not repudiate the idea that the church spoken of in the Scriptures can in any sense mean a visible church here on earth, whose membership might be counted by men here on earth, having conditions of membership visible and tangible to men right down here? Or do they not say that it always refers to the invisible church whose conditions of membership have been revealed clearly to us, but the records of which are unknown to us and only kept above by the recording angel whose faithful hand never makes a mistake and gets some name that does not belong, that has not complied with the conditions? Then tell me how "grievous wolves" could get their names in on this record **among** them, not sparing the flock. "Also of yourselves shall men arise [not of the world but of yourselves], and speak [preach] perverse things to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:29.

We can understand how they could go through the door of the visible church and get among them, but not how such could get into their company above. I do not think it will work very well as no man, unless made new in Christ Jesus as a real member of His body, can be numbered among them there, though might get in here below, as Judas did (Acts 1:17). Some of those who had been added to the church at Jerusalem (perhaps a church of from 10,000 to 15,000 members), went out from them (Acts 15:24), whom Paul calls false brethren (Gal. 2:4), and says they ought to be cut off (Gal. 5:12). This all shows they had got through the door into this church among them. I very much doubt that the angel had recorded their names above, and so numbered them among its members there.

These had received the word gladly (Acts 2:41) and heard the answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" Viz.: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 16:37. "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." Acts 8:37. They had passed through this examination favorably and the administrator had appealed to those present to see if anyone objected to these being baptized (Acts 10:47), and so they were added to the church

and numbered among them. Their names were put on the record so we could count them just how many added. Acts 2:41; 4:4. Now these "false teachers" of which Peter speaks (2 Pet. 2:1), and belong to that class who have been in the faith but have departed and are now "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils and are speaking lies" (1 Tim. 4:1-2) and those of that class spoken of in 2 Tim. 3:3-4: "False accusers, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded \* \* \* having a form of godliness; ever learning but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." What will they do with these fellows? Will they follow the instructions of the great Head of the church (Matt. 18:17) and obey the commandment of Paul (2 Thess. 3:4-6) and so "withdraw from them," cut them off (Gal. 5:12) and put them away from among themselves? (1 Cor. 5:13)—what does Elder Jones say to do with them? Just let them be. That is let them be where, in the church? Yes, remain where they are. Could the enemy ask for more liberty than that? Think of it. To be in good standing in the church, preaching lies, doctrines of devils and damnable heresies, traitors, pulling down the church and the work of God, learning every day how to do it more successfully, but never getting to the truth. That is just what the devil promised the angels, great freedom and liberty.

That beats that little paper I have referred to that only granted him liberty to speak through its columns. This grants him all he ever asked, just the privilege of staying in the church and being one of them.

Now, Elder, tell the public how you made up your report of your meetings at College View. How did you get them counted? Did you take this number you reported through the Christian Order I have referred to? Remember, you claim Holy Ghost organization. Was this number added to the church like these referred to in the apostolic days? Did you baptize this number? Did the rest of them profess to believe in any way? And were those who you baptized not believers in everything but your views on organization? Now, Brother Jones, is

this not true, that you counted everyone who attended your meetings here and in Lincoln? I never could count over fifty here who attended at any one time, and I was one of them, so I suppose I am one of your converts.

The heresies referred to, etc., are not quoted for any other purpose than to show that this kind of an organized church could not dispose of unruly members or withdraw from them. So let no one get a wrong idea from the object of referring to these Scriptures, and further let no one refer to such texts as Matt. 13:29 (Tares are a kind of pulse, noxious weeds hurtful, but do not destroy the wheat), and array them against these texts referred to. The Bible is a harmony. Heresies and open wickedness are quite different things from tares. "Nothing but the all-seeing eye could discriminate and root out the tares. So the church should not attempt to do the work that belongs to the Judge of all the earth. Who can read the heart? Who can distinguish the tares from the wheat \* \* \* open sin excludes the guilty." "Desire of Ages," p. 656.

I have quoted these different statements in these exhibits two or three times, and have also requoted the Scriptures and Testimonies to show them from different viewpoints. Sometimes to get their meaning from the standpoint of organization and again to show that the organization was a systematic union of individuals in a body with officers having authority, united for one purpose.

I do not want to be unkind or bring a railing accusation against anyone, but felt it my duty to call attention to these facts which I know everyone did not have access to.

This move looks to me just like all the rest of the rebellions which have arisen, and the object of which is to harrass and hinder our work. While some things said may appear very antagonistic and unkind, yet I have not meant them so. I want to sustain that relation to everyone that I may even admonish them as a brother and be in full accord with Paul.

I know as the years go by as a people we feel more

and more like going straight forward with our work and pay no attention to opposition, especially where it has degenerated into rebellion; and leave God to take care of it, but as I have said there is a part of this work He left for man to do, and the only question for us to be sure about is not to try to do God's part of it. If I know the truth, I know that anyone who goes back on it and tries to tear it down is in rebellion. I know that two times two are four, and any man who says it is five is wrong. I have given some of my reasons for thinking as I do. Now if it is rebellion we know the great master mind has charge of it, and we may expect to hear from him, for he was never known to be quiet when he can get any clue at all, and he can generally muster something.

There is no record in all the Bible of such a solemn warning and fearful threatening as is set forth in Rev. 14:6, 15, in unmistakable terms. It is the most unreasonable thing to suppose that a God of mercy and love would punish His children with unmixed wrath, threatened here, if it was impossible for them to find out the meaning of the terms of the Message, and so it would be just as unreasonable to suppose that they never could find out when and where it belonged, the time when due and a clear fulfillment, such a fitness of the facts that no one need be deceived. So there can be no reasonable excuse on the part of those who honestly seek to know. While this Message fits all these prominent points with scrupulous exactness, all these characteristics are met, and it comes at a time when the church is weighed down with a form of godliness but destitute of power; at a time when the mad rush for pelf and gold seems to rule the hearts of men with all the power of a demon's sway; at a time of a peace and safety cry, and that right in the face of the most unexampled collection of the munitions for war and unparalleled preparations for battle; at a time when men's hearts are failing them for fear and for looking after those things coming upon the earth; at a time when men are deceiving and being deceived; at a time when the world is deluded with its errors, overwhelmed with its

business, crazed with its cares, delirious with its pleasures and parlyzed with its vice. There is nothing that can awake us from this deathlike stupor that prevails everywhere like this warning Message. There is nothing that reins us up to the solemn realities of the judgment like this "judgment cry" Message. So we see there is a crying demand on the part of the church for just this kind of a Message to meet these emergencies and save a remnant people. So God has encouraged His church by leaving on record in His prophetic word, and oft repeated in these long chains of prophecies a link definitely located in the chain within the pale of certainty to encourage His faithful servants with unbounded faith and confidence. That this message has been on the wing ever since 1844 and its circle around the world is almost complete, is a fact beyond dispute.

I desire to treat every soul right in this world. My duty to God comes first, and in doing that, if it compels me to carry reproof, rebuke, or oppose my best friends, I feel it a duty to do it as kindly as I am able to do.

May the Lord hasten the time when we all may be of the same mind and the same judgment, seeing eye to eye. It is time for us to "lift up our heads when these things begin to come to pass" (above referred to bright lights going out); it is high time now, after so many of these things spoken of to us as a people have been so literally fulfilled, to look up and be encouraged "for our redemption draweth nigh." Instead of these things being a source of discouragement, they should be a means of confidence and faith, for we know that the warning words by His servant have been literally fulfilled before our eyes. These things should lead us to seek the preparation that we each so much need that we may be able to stand in that coming time.







## ERRATA

Page 170, tenth line from top should read:  
"Through the worldly sanctuary."

Page 178, first line should read: "I would not  
found;" and line eighteen: "it is a new and living way."

Page 201, second line, insert at close of sentence:  
"Viz.: 'two atonements; one on the mercyseat, one on  
the head of the scapegoat'. 'Cast Out,' p. 74."

On pages 213 and 214, the quotations are from  
"Patriarchs and Prophets," pp. 356, 357.

Page 214, ninth line from bottom should read:  
"two sermons each to show why."

Page 216, last line of "No. 7" should read: "gives  
as a definition of 'veil,' 'a covering that hangs down!'"

Page 223, in third paragraph near its close read:  
"blows her breath of triumph."

Second line from bottom, same page, read "so  
shock."

# APPENDIX

---

## AN OBJECT LESSON

In attending one of Elder Jones' meetings I got an object lesson on organization. The elder assumed the leadership, or the chairmanship of the meeting. I say assumed because he was not appointed nor elected by that definite assemblage, as I was present and speak from knowledge, and so he dictated it from start to finish, as much and even more, than any chairman ever does among the children of this world. Notice the following particulars: He ordered the assembly to sing on a certain page, and they sang. Then again and again repeated this order. Then he said, "Brother Ballenger, you pray." Brother B. prayed when he was told. No objections offered yet, for they all submitted to his authority which was in exercising the leadership or chairmanship of that meeting. Then after reading from the "Two Republics," and his comments on the Scripture that "Christ is the head of every man," left the chair and took the judge's seat and entered into the inner chamber of the hearts of the S. D. A. denomination and found we did not believe this; that we did not and dare not preach it. I told him we did, but he repeated his decision. I told him he was wrong, but instead of giving his reasons for this verdict he told me to try it and I would find out. So he left me to study out his reasons. Next he said we could not preach on federation of churches because we were a federation, so he proved the first statement by his last statement in this case. So by this kind of logic you see a man can prove anything. Now, after proving these two points, as stated above, he asked now who has changed, the denomination or Jones?

Next, Sunday labor question. Well, he did make a little show of proof. First, Elder Daniells would not allow the workmen at Takoma Park to work on Sunday.

A voice in the audience, "Brother Jones, perhaps it was a matter of courtesy to that strange people." He answers, "**No.**" So here he had to enter again into the secret chambers of the heart and saw it was not that, but did not tell us what it was. With that big, drawn-out "**no**" you could tell he was sure of that. Then he said, "We will not have any more of that kind of remarks." And so we see the way Brother Jones believes in religious liberty and freedom of speech, especially when he wants to get into the S. D. A. church to give two long discourses showing the S. D. A. have gone back on these things referred to, and he complained and calls us the papacy, etc., when he was refused, but he himself would stop a man's mouth, even when it had only a very little tincture of an objection to his conclusion, and the rest of us sat by and submitted to the decision.

Then I analyzed that thing. I saw I had better keep still, for my remark was more than tinctured with an objection. Then I thought Jones is not my head nor my leader, why should he stop my mouth, but good sense says he is the leader, the head in authority, to say what shall be ruled out of this meeting. So he has a right to say, "Elder, stop"; if not, I might go on and that other man might go on till his meeting is broken up. So now I asked the elder when he was setting forth what I believed if he would allow me to say "amen," but answered so hesitatingly with that authoritative Jones look I said to myself, I will keep still.

But we did not complain, just submitted only on his assuming to know what we believed and was teaching without giving any evidence on some of these things which so misrepresented us that it looked bad to us. If he could have given or read evidence that would have been all right. Now if I had been evilly inclined so much as to call him the pope for some of his dictatorial ways, even right here in these meetings it would look a little hard. But he doesn't hesitate to call us the papacy, and I know that never in all these fifty years of my experience have I ever known one of our presidents to go beyond these very principles which Jones endorsed

and put into practice to the extreme.

Our presidents, as it happens, have all been very modest men and never magnified their office by assuming popish authority. Now, let us look at that statement of his, "We will not have any more of that kind of remarks," from a Jones standpoint. This was a matured thought of his, as he had stated it before. Of course he was on his guard and was careful for him, as he was trying to prove that we were the papacy. It was the overflowing thought of his mind, or he would not have said it. But right here is your own word, the authoritative word of one man to tell the many what they may say and what they may not say, what they may do and what they may not do, to which private judgment must be surrendered under the alternative of being guilty of disorder. Is this one of the fundamental principles of your reformation?

The facts are these: a man can't run a meeting and be responsible for good order without assuming the same kind of authority that a chairman does in the common business world, and the chairman can go so far as to turn the disorderly over to the legal authorities, or as Paul says in church work, to turn them over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh. That is outside of the tent, the church, from among the the people of God (1 Cor. 5:5), or to use Paul's words, "That the one who did this deed might be taken away from among you." Now, the Elder endorsed every one of these principles here in these meetings.

I have not seized upon just one word or phrase like Elder Jones did in the "Protestant Magazine," which is so unfair with any man, but I have taken the whole tenor or the general drift of his words. I say every one of these principles are recognized to the limit when followed out to their logical end, and in one sense there is one kind of force in it, for it puts a man into a place or an attitude which is not his free will or choice, a place which he had no desire to go. This is the feelings of a man when he is deprived of a desired privilege of speaking his mind. This is the way Jones felt when the authorities decided that they did not want his kind of re-

marks in the church. Just the same as he said to us in the tent that night, "We don't want any more of that kind of remarks" (here in the tent). Not that he wished to interfere with our liberty in saying and doing what we pleased in our own tent outside of his, Jones knew he was not very far away from Paul's line of procedure when he said in Gal. 2:4, 5, "Because of false brethren" who came around privily, to whom Paul "gave place by subjection," no, not for an hour. We believe in religious liberty, but not in religious license to do wrong or any way that would interfere with gospel order. As I said, he exceeded the authority of a chairman in common business affairs. They allow perfect parliamentary liberty to each and every one away beyond what Elder Jones allowed. Yet he says anything modeled after the civil government is the papacy, but if you can excel it and go beyond it in limiting the rights of individuals, will it cease to be the papacy?

We will take these principles and apply them to our ideas of gospel order: first, Christ is the head of every man or the leader. This object lesson teaches that we must have a visible head or leader; second, it teaches authority in this visible head or leader; third, that authority has a right, yea, a duty to say what kind of sermons or remarks shall be submitted to the congregation over which he has been placed, elected, or even assumed the place of overseer, as that duty or right holds him responsible for what goes on there; fourth, hence that duty compels him to stop those remarks in his assembly that in his judgment would operate to tear down his work and bring in disorder and confusion; fifth, that it is his duty to go the limit of his authority to preserve that degree of order and harmony which the best interests of the cause demands. Now, that is what we believe, but of course he did it in the Jones way. Now, if there were anything wrong it was not in these principles but in the way it was done. Now, this adopts everything we argue for in church organization and discipline, and this lesson recognizes the right and duty to turn a so-called brother out of the church or congregation. Now, there is just

the one point left to be very careful upon—how we do it. If we follow the instruction of the great Head of the church, then that will make all things just and right; it makes no difference who complains or what the results are. Now, how can any consistent man adopt these principles in his camp meeting and call the S. D. A. the papacy because they believe in adopting them in the church at large. Brother Jones recognized them where he is responsible for good order, and did bring a measure of force on every one of us, giving us all to understand that he was the leader, no difference what we believed on leadership; and this carried to its logical ends, would put a man out of any assembly if he continued in his disorderly way just as every man who endorses that and believes that must believe if consistent in doing the same in the church.

The following thought, definitely expressed, has been overlooked in the body of this article, which we greatly deserved to have on record lest we might be misunderstood. And as every subject may be viewed from different standpoints and hence might make a great difference in the conclusion, and as we have stated before that words have different meanings and mean differently when differently combined with other words, so we hope to state so definitely and explicitly that which the tenor of all our remarks show, so every one may understand and no one could pervert without the inspiration of the great master mind.

Now, the authority referred to, to be exercised by the church or its officers, is not absolute authority that inheres in either one of them independent of the scriptural conditions, for every act must stand the crucial test of the divine word, as that word is the ultimate and final appeal.

Just the same as individuals by their words and acts they are justified or condemned. They are in Christ's stead, representing Christ; His ambassadors; His word of reconciliation committed to them. They are responsible to that government for every act. See Heb. 13:17: "Obey them that have the rule over you and submit your-

selves for they watch for your souls as they that must give an account."

An ambassador is one commissioned as an agent or representative sent by one sovereign power to another, and the moment they violate the conditions of their ambassadorship they are withdrawn and cease to be a legal representative and hence lose all that authority that their commission gave them.

You give your agent a power of an attorney to do a certain business for you; to sell your stock on your farm and lease the said farm and invest the money in certain bank stock, but instead of strictly following the terms of his commission he sells the farm stock and all and loans the money to a personal friend. He made a deed, but could he deed away that farm? No. Because he had no authority. He was not authorized to do that kind of business and the law would not allow that action to stand and the records would show that it was a fraud.

Just so with the church when it does not strictly follow the divine instructions, but if it does follow them then the principal or great head of the church will never go back on his own words, but will endorse what was done as freely as done in person by himself.

We will go back to the Sunday labor question. Jones quotes the president of the Central Union as saying that we had changed. Now, if that was the Denomination instead of one man, he had a point, and to make that appear he said this little leaflet letter size was denominational literature when the denomination as a denomination had never seen it, for the denomination does not take little tracts like that and pass upon them. That was nothing but his assertion, contrary to the facts in general. Now, the facts are these about Sunday labor: That there crept into this denomination through some of the leaders of the religious liberty folks this extreme view on Sunday labor and it was preached throughout our denomination till a large number endorsed it, for the men who preached it were very popular men in the denomination at that time. And what they said was taken for granted to be true, while Sister White, and such men

as Uriah Smith and others of that class, who were the real founders of the Message, never endorsed it. So you see, Test No. 9, instead of being something new to us old fellows, was just bringing the denomination back to its first and old position. See Test. Vol. 1, p. 354. That was fifty-two years ago, and then Sunday labor was not to be the test, but to disregard the Sabbath was to be the test.

---

### Extracts from a Tract by Eld. G. A. Irwin, "The Mark of the Beast"

On page 6 of a leaflet bearing the title of "Special Testimonies to Battle Creek Church," dated January 11, 1897, the following definite statement is made: "The sign or seal of God is the observance of the Seventh-day Sabbath, and the Lord's Memorial of his work of creation. \* \* \* The Mark of the Beast is the opposite of this, the observance of the first day of the week." In the same leaflet, under the sub-head of "True Education in our Churches," the question is stated thus "John was called to behold a people distinct from those who worship the **Beast or his Image** by keeping the **first day of the week**. **The observance of this day is the Mark of the Beast.**" In a manuscript bearing date of 1899 these words occur: "It is for the interest of all to understand what the Mark of the Beast is, and how they may escape the dread threatenings of God. Why are men not interested to know what constitutes the Mark of the Beast and his image? It is in direct contrast with the **Mark of God.**" Reference is then made to Ex. 31:2-17, which shows that the Sabbath is the Sign or Seal of God. Numerous other references might be taken from Sister White's writings that state the same fact by inference, if not in such plain terms as the foregoing. So that her position on the question of **what constitutes the Mark of the Beast** is clear and plain. And this is the position that was taken by the **pioneers in this message** after a careful study of the Prophecies, and to which the Denomination has held all the **years of its existence**, and still holds.



This brings us to the consideration of the second question, "**WHEN IS THE MARK RECEIVED?**" This is where the confusion comes in, and the minds of men are led to different conclusions. But this part of the question is just as plain as the first, when all that has been written upon the subject is taken as it is written, **and not as garbled sentences** and parts of sentences taken from the middle of paragraphs and out of their connection and setting and made the premise of an argument and opinion.

In a communication written in Australia, and bearing the date of November 20, 1895, the statement is made that **"refraining from work on Sunday is NOT receiving the Mark of the Beast; and when this will advance the interests of the work, it should be done."** Elsewhere in the same communication this statement is made, **"At present Sunday-keeping is not the test."** About the time this communication was written, Sunday laws were being rigidly enforced in Tennessee, and some of our brethren were in jail for working on Sunday. Those in charge of the **Religious Liberty Work at that time were teaching that to refrain from work on Sunday**, because of the law, was receiving the Mark of the Beast. During the agitation a letter was sent to Sister White to inquire if she had any light on the question, and the communication referred to came in reply. The communication was accepted by all **at that time as light from God.**

Following the statement that **"At present Sunday-keeping is not the test,"** she says, "The time will come when men will not only forbid Sunday work, but they will try to force men to labor on the Sabbath. And men will be asked to renounce the Sabbath, and to subscribe to Sunday observance or forfeit their freedom and their lives."

In the year 1861, thirty-four years prior to the foregoing date, a similar statement was made, and **can be found in Vol. 1, page 354.** It reads as follows: "The decree will go forth that they must disregard the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, and honor the first day, or lose their lives." In the communication bearing the date of 1895 this statement occurs, "The final issue of the Sab-

bath question has not yet come, and by imprudent actions we may bring on a crisis before the time." "The time has not yet come for us to work as though there were no prejudices. Christ said, 'Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves.' If you see that by doing certain things which you have a perfect right to do you hinder the work of the truth, refrain from doing those things. Do nothing that will close the minds of others against the truth. There is a world to save, and we gain nothing by cutting loose from those we are trying to help. (All things may be lawful, but all things are not expedient or wise).

\* \* \* On Sunday there is the very best opportunity for those who are missionaries to hold Sunday schools, and come to the people in the simplest manner possible, telling them of the love of Jesus for sinners, and educating them in the Scriptures." Seven years later, when a crisis in the enforcement of Sunday laws in Australia seemed imminent, the same counsel was given; "The light given me by the Lord at a time when we were expecting just such a crisis as you seem to be approaching was, that when the people were moved by a power from beneath to enforce Sunday observance, Seventh-day Adventists **were to show their wisdom** by refraining from their ordinary work on that day, devoting it to missionary efforts.

"To defy the Sunday laws will but strengthen in their persecution the religious zealots who are seeking to enforce them. Give them no occasion to call you lawbreakers. If they are left to rein up men who fear neither God nor man, the reining up will soon lose its novelty for them, and they will see that it is not consistent nor convenient for them to be strict in regard to the observance of Sunday. Keep right on with your missionary work, with your Bibles in your hands, and the enemy will see that he has worsted his own cause. **One does not receive the Mark of the Beast because he shows that he realizes the wisdom of keeping the peace by refraining from work that gives offence, doing at the same time a work of the highest importance.**" Vol. 9, p. 232.

The following statement, taken from the "Question

Chair," Review and Herald of March 9, 1897, so fully accords with the foregoing instruction, that it fits in right here and shows that our church paper under the able editorship of Elder Uriah Smith, stood for the same views relative to the Mark of the Beast, as those enunciated by Sister White in all her writings where this subject is under consideration.

Ques. "Is Sunday-keeping the Mark of the Beast independently of its enforcement by the two-horned beast?"

Ans. "An institution may have an inherent nature in itself, and yet be clothed with a new significance, or assume a new character, by special circumstances connected with it. We take this to be the case with Sunday-keeping. It is a child of the papacy, with paganism as its fosterfather. It grew to such a position of prominence that the papacy adopted it as an emblem of its authority and a badge of its power. Ever since that time it has been in its inherent nature, 'the Mark of the Beast.' But multitudes have been led into its observance with no idea that it is an institution of the church, or that it is claimed by Roman Catholics as such. This may be said, perhaps, of the entire Protestant church. But in the last great conflict between truth and error, when those who are coming up to the condition of translation and are to be purged from every relic of the apostasy, the fact that this institution is the **banner** and mark of that power symbolized by the beast, is to be brought out in great distinctness, and when the issue is thus clearly made, every one, by his attitude toward this institution, will show whether his allegiance is to the human or the divine. Then the observance of Sunday will have a new significance; it will then have a new **character**. It will then be, in the **prophetic sense**, the mark of the beast, as **opposed to the mark, or seal of God**. And until it reaches this stage, prophecy does not take cognizance of it as the mark of the beast. And it is only in this sense in which it is used in prophecy, that we have to do with it."

(Pages 4 to 7)

Now, lay one of Jones' statements down here. While he does not believe Test. No. 9, he pretended to believe the testimonies back at the South Lancaster meeting and Vol. 1 was one of them at that time, also all that were quoted on that occasion which you see he does not believe. Now, when he preaches on **his** organization theory you will find in his little tract, "The Final Word," p. 51, in his confession of **faith**, statement 5, "I hold that Sister Ellen G. White is a messenger of God with a message to the people." Will Rupert and Ballenger say "Amen?" This was said after Jones had started off on his tangent. Now, statement 4, "I hold that the testimonies are not in addition to the Bible, that they are not to take the place of the Bible; but that they are to bring us to the Bible and to help us to a better understanding of the Bible, and as such they are and always will be **welcome to me.**" Now, I will freely give Rupert and Ballenger the privilege of saying "Amen," yea, more than that, Jones also. You take them and welcome them to a better understanding of Sunday labor and the organization questions. You took them at South Lancaster on that subject then, and you surely know, yes, Rupert and Ballenger too well know, that you have gone back not only on the Third Angel's Message, but you have gone back on your own confession of faith articles 4 and 5.

He refers to a campaign in his leaflet and a statement made concerning it, and so quotes, "That it is a campaign against error and to uproot the baneful influence of the seeds of doubt." Then he quotes further from the said statement, "Elder Jones may boast if he wishes that he will never take any part in this campaign against error." Jones answers, "I do not particularly boast, but I never will take any part in it." Then says, "It is infinitely better to preach the truth than it is to campaign against error. \* \* \* Many times lately have I been asked how is this controversy going to be stopped. I answer, I do not know how it is going to be stopped, but I know how it can be stopped in a day. Let each person himself stop it and go to preaching the Third Angel's Message. \* \* \* That is what I now purpose only to do." Then,

further on, says, "I am done with it [controversy].  
 \* \* \* So now I say I shall spend my time in preaching the Third Angel's Message.... not indirectly through some other issue, but directly as that message is in the Bible and as it is called for by the awful conditions in the world and amongst the nations."

Now, I must confess that these were pretty good conclusions, and when Jones started out he started on that line, and when he first came to Lincoln on his lecture tour he stuck pretty close to it, and I could not even get him to come up and stay all night with me for fear he might be misjudged, for I wanted to admonish him of the great danger of doing just what he is doing now contrary to these statements. I have quoted from his leaflet, pp. 47, 48, 49. Now he can come to College View and stay weeks, and instead of stopping the controversy and preaching the Third Angel's Message as it is in the Bible, not indirectly through some other issue, but directly; now in the face of all these statements of his he boldly announces that he will show in two discourses why he was cast out. Then when he comes to show us he says, "I am preaching nothing but the Third Angel's Message," while he had announced that the subject would be "Cast Out."

Now, we knew Elder Jones could not live up to those statements of his, for they were contrary to the cause he had espoused; even went so far away from them that he could challenge our brethren to a controversy and they would not lend themselves to it. So he blames them for that. (See his words to Spicer.) Now, who has changed on this point, who has stopped this controversy? Let each person himself stop. Has **he** stopped? He said he would, and finds fault with the brethren because they **have** stopped. Then he uses the reproachful word, "You are now assuming the holy attitude that you would not wish to lend yourself in any way to a campaign of opposition," etc. "It would be amusing if it was not disgusting." These men surely agree in their tactics and the course they pursue, even if they disagree in their fundamentals.

It seems to be very hard for these men to state any

of these questions pertaining to the denomination so fairly that the outside world can get a true understanding of our position. Elder Ballenger, in "Gathering Call," April 14, 1914, says: "I was cast out for exactly the same truth that Elder J. H. Waggoner taught in his work on 'The Atonement.' I was tried, convicted, and denounced as a dangerous man."

Let us see what Waggoner does say: "I think no doubt can remain that the judgment of the saints, the blotting out of sin, the making of the atonement, and the cleansing of the sanctuary are identical." "Atonement," p. 124.

"The atonement is the work of the priest in the most holy place," p. 125. "It is a matter of wonder that any Bible reader ever for a moment recognizes as true the idea that death makes the atonement when it is always represented as the work of the priest with the blood of the offering in the sanctuary. So the offering or death of Christ on Calvary was for all the world and the atonement only for those who repented," p. 125. So it was not made on Calvary nor was it made till the very last work of our great high Priest and only for those who afflicted their souls. So Waggoner says no atonement was made for those who did not repent (p. 126). But Elder B. says in this issue quoted, "The atonement was general"—that is, for all. But why try to make it appear that he agrees with our leading authorities and was cast out for such a belief?

In hearing Elder Jones and analyzing his course, I could but think of a monocyclist that came to our town to demonstrate his craft. He convinced me that a man can ride one wheel, and also convinced me that it took a well-trained expert to do it. In order to hold his position he had to turn and twist his body in all kinds of shapes and change with great rapidity backward and forward, to the right and left, and then sometimes go down. You see, it is something like a milk stool: you must sit on it or hold to it to make it stand up. His great effort was to show that the denomination had gone back instead of he. He says: "In 1901 the denomination was brought to the

very threshold of the Christian and New Testament order. But instead of **going on** through the open door fully into evangelical Christianity, in 1902 that whole order was reversed." (Appeal, p. 49.) Then again he said: "If you do so \* \* \* which he claims they did, then you will be back to Egypt." Now, we see from what he says here that instead of going on through the open door we went back. He does not claim that we went back any during the two years from 1899 to 1901. But in 1902 we reversed our engine and started back. As he was with us up to 1902, and had much to do with that movement in 1901, so of course the inference is that if we had allowed him to lead us on we would have gone through that open door fully into that evangelical Christianity of his, where the Lord can have His way, and "you will let the Holy Ghost be King," p. 47.

"The Holy Spirit is sole sovereign, King, Guide, and all in all," p. 48. So you see, if we had gone through that open door we would now have for our leader the King and Guide, the Holy Ghost. Somehow I think we would have had somebody else for leader, king and guide. Jones No. 2 went on through the open door and the denomination went back, if we let him tell it, at least as far back as the previous General Conference (1899) had landed us. But where was that? Let Jones No. 1 tell us where we stood at that time. (Remember that in 1901 we stood at an open door.) See all the exhibits from one to eleven. If Jones No. 1 was right it is not a very bad place to go back to. Let us look at some of these eleven exhibits. Well, instead of riding on this one-wheeled vehicle we have gone back to the vehicle with wheels within wheels and God's hand is moving all the wheels. So they are living wheels (Eze. 1) and they can stand alone without a human hand (Exhibit F). Yes, gone back without abandoning the Christian order near enough to the Mosaic order to hear Moses and the prophets and believe (Luke 16:3, Exhibit G). Yes, gone back to that organization so firmly rooted and grounded that nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand could not destroy it (for God is in it), much less a handful of puny men (Ex-

hibit B). Yes, and to that one that Jones No. 1 said was God's own and would continue to the end. Yes, gone back to that church where Christ is the head of the church and His testimony is in the church, and He will remain in it till the end (Exhibit B). Yes, gone back, not to Rome nor the papacy, but so far off that you dare not, you must not even talk about us being the papacy (Exhibit A). Yes, back to that General Conference whose voice was the voice of God (Exhibit D), and where Jones was called by God and put in a place of authority and honor. Yes, back, clear back, where you must not even think that God's cause is going to pieces, much less preach it (Exhibit K).

Yes, Brother Jones, have you not gone far enough through that open door to satisfy yourself, Rupert, and Ballenger that you can not agree even on fundamentals after eight years of trial? You had all better decide to come back or go back, as you call it, where Jones No. 1 said God can cause us to see exactly alike, and then cites a case where more than a dozen met together and not three of them of the same mind and in a **little** while God caused the whole number to see **exactly** alike (Exhibit I).

We trust that all we have said will not serve to bolster us up to believe that we are all right, but rather let it humble our hearts in sorrow to think that it is possible that our spiritual condition may be such as to cause the Lord to suffer such experiences to befall us on account of our dereliction to duty and lack of loyalty to Him. He allows these things to come to awaken us from the stupor and indifference that has fallen upon us in this watching hour. How few of us are posted and know definitely the reasons for our faith. Instead of growing and becoming stronger and more settled in the message every day we become weaker, for these points fade away unless we continue to study the Word.

I have wished that in what I said I had known how to have said it in a better way, but have felt keenly that these facts ought to be brought out some way. I have had a desire not to say anything unnecessarily to alienate or drive these brethren farther away, so I could not do my duty and thus carry out Paul's admonition to admonish them as brethren (2. Thess. 3:15).



## LETTER FROM ELDER JONES

1441 D Street,  
Lincoln, Neb.,  
August 2, 1914.

Eld. J. H. Morrison,  
College View, Nebr.

Dear Brother:

Late yesterday afternoon I had the first chance to see your book. I note your address to me personally on pp. 88-89, where you say:

"Now we have a man who will meet you at any time and place, and he will not place you under any restrictions, law or order, but accept you on your honor, expecting you to be fair, with the understanding that you reaffirm what you said in College View, December, 1913, viz., that you preach and believe the same as you did on organization twenty years ago."

I write this to inform you that I accept that proposal. Will you please inform that man to this effect?

I cannot **just now** name the time and place, but I will do this as soon as possible. I write this much **now** to let you know that your proposal is accepted, and that **he** may know this at the earliest day.

I should like that he will meet my propositions **in their order** as I have given them, and to which you refer; viz.,—

1. That he tell the people publicly, **wherein** I have given up or gone off from the Third Angel's Message.

2. Wherein I have given up or gone off from any single truth of that Message.

3. Wherein I have given up or gone off from any single truth of any kind.

And he is at liberty, at any place in the three, or after the three, to use your "Jones No. 1," and "Jones No. 2" and all that you have quoted and said in that connection.

Also I wish that he shall accept my challenge to "Elders Daniells, Spicer, Prescott, or any other man," to which you refer. Your statement in your book is in

that direct connection, and implies that he is ready to do this. I desire that he shall.

Of course it is understood that **the Bible** is the standard and test of what is truth.

Please let me know as soon as you can whether he accepts this as I have written it; and if not **all** of it, then how much of it. Then I can the better name the time.

Truly,  
ALONZO T. JONES.

---

### ELDER MORRISON'S REPLY

College View, Nebr.,  
August 7, 1914.

Dear Brother Jones:

I received your communication and note what you say. I have been very busy for the last few days, as you know I earn my bread by the sweat of the brow, and hence a little delay.

First, I want to express my desire that our correspondence in this way will not serve to separate us socially, for I hope to keep in the condition of mind to be always glad to meet you on the praying side of eternity, but as far as our theological views are concerned, I think we are about as far apart as we can get as long as you hold and preach that we are on the lead in this great church federation movement and that we are like the papacy, and are indeed the papacy itself, so long this antagonism between us will continue. I have no confidence at all in the course you pursue in the fight you are making against our people. I say it is rebellion instead of a reformation, and it crops out in every sermon that I have heard you preach, both in spirit and in word.

Now, the main object, of course, of this letter, is not to reprove you, or try to set you right, but to relieve you of that suspense that our statement in that little booklet seems to place you, and I shall try to do this frankly. I want to call your attention, Brother Jones, first, to the fact that you have misapprehended the ques-

tion, and stated three propositions for discussions of your own, and then suggest a fourth one, viz.:

1. "That he tell the people publicly wherein I have given up, or gone off from the Third Angel's Message.

2. "Wherein I have given up or gone off from any single truth of the Third Angel's Message.

3. "Wherein I have given up or gone off from any single truth of any kind.

"Also I wish that he shall accept my challenge to Elders Daniells, Spicer, Prescott, or any other man."

First. I want to thank you for further evidence on the subject that your movement carries the marks of rebellion. This is appreciated more especially because it is new, right from headquarters. I refer to this willingness of yourself to engage in this conflict, battle, or fight. This, you know, is a peculiar characteristic of rebellion—always ready for battle, always in a fearful suspense that they will lose their ammunition and not have a chance to use it. I said on page 8 of this little booklet, "Mark the spirit that characterized these reformers, that it was not a warlike and belligerent spirit, a desire to down something else and build on their ruins, while all these other moves referred to commenced to tear down what they had helped to build up, challenge and re-challenge our people for battle; and so we see the dominant and out-gushing spirit of all these movements is just the same."

Now, you know we gave you no cause to hope that any one of our leading, active men would engage with you in such affray. In fact, it was not intimated that there were more than this one man that would, only on certain conditions, and there was the least little glimmer of hope on which you might cling to in our statement on page 89, paragraph 2, but everybody could see that that would be a very great emergency. Think of it! You hastened so very quickly, got the book late in the afternoon, scanned it so closely that you found the only place in the 159 pages where there was any encouragement given that you could have a chance to display your skill and show your prowess on the battle field. I say hastened—only slept one night till you got your proposal

off, looking very much like you feared something might happen to prevent the war cloud from emptying all its fury.

Now, you say, "I write this to inform you that I accept that proposal. Please inform that man to this effect." This might not be understood unless we had the proposal clearly stated before us. Turn to the pages to which you refer, 88 and 89: "Now Elder Jones, as to that challenge to Elder Daniells, Spicer, or any other man." Then follows a statement of our views of going into a jangle of this kind clearly, definitely, and explicitly stated, so no one could misunderstand me. It is there clearly stated that we could not voluntarily plan to do anything of the kind; that is, to call the public together to witness a hand to hand conflict between two ministers, both Sabbath-keepers. I have too much respect for the cause to bring reproach upon it from the outside world, as I think that would do. You will see that I give an illustration of this point in this book, pages 86 and 87, the case of Mr. Bryan being challenged to meet Mr. Baily, of Texas, in debate. He refused on the same ground that I refer to.

Now, I have referred to some of the thoughts expressed at the time when this so-called proposal was made, as it was made under the pressure of your challenges, and also Rupert's, to me personally, which indicated to me that fight, war, and battle were the fundamentals of your movement. The eagerness and avidity with which you grasp this morsel like a starving man strengthens that conclusion. So now under those convictions, I made this proposal without revealing the name, so as to further develop the spirit of your cause, and if it developed, as I was quite sure it would, and as it has, then I would give his name, and that is a personage spoken of and occupying a prominent place in this booklet; viz., **Jones Number 1.**

Now, Brother Jones, I did not mean to provoke you in this matter, but I did not see how we could satisfy your longings in any better way, believing as we do. The proposal, "Now we have a man (spoken of in this

book as such) who will meet you at any time or place, and he will not place you under any restrictions, law, or order, but accept you on your honor and expect you to be fair, with the understanding that you will reaffirm what you said here in College View, December, 1913; viz., that you now preach and believe the same as you did on organization twenty years ago." I knew Jones Number 1 had a little story he could tell in his own quiet way if he had a chance to do it that way, and will grant you the privileges that I have spoken of, and perhaps more. But if you were dealing with me, I would hold you to the statement of the question, or proposal without allowing you to ring in any changes, and I would hold that you must prove it in the terms of that proposition which you say you accept, but you go right away from the proposal and name these other three propositions and don't say one word about the proposed question. You say the Bible is to be the standard and test of what is true. If you mean Bible truth, I say amen, but look at the question, "Does Jones preach the same as he did twenty years ago on organization?" The question is not whether Jones preaches the Bible truth on organization now, nor even twenty years ago, but Does he preach the same he did twenty years ago? As I said, if a man was dealing with me and we had laid down a proposition to prove or disprove and he should ignore that proposition and understate to prove something else, I would hold him up at once. Now tell us how the Bible could be the test whether Jones preaches the same now he did twenty years ago? Suppose I am arrested for stealing a horse, shall we apply to the Bible or my record? I think, Brother Jones, your record in this case would be the test. Think of it! For you to compel a man to prove by the Bible that you had changed. I imagine that I see him go to Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, or the New Testament to find where Jones had changed. Then I see you going back to the old Mosaic order to prove you had not changed.

Now I guess you understand me. The secret is revealed and I don't think I have anything more to say,

but remain yours as ever, knowing it is a friendly act to point out a man's mistakes.

Another thought I had in mind which was omitted and that was that I was trained to believe by our leaders fifty years ago that it was wrong to challenge our opposers and to keep out if possible from such conflicts as the Scriptures were against them and contrary to our Message, etc. I never challenged a man in my life.

Yours truly,

J. H. MORRISON.

And so the correspondence closed.

---

[Had I thought that the Elder would have had any trouble about deciding who the man was ready to meet him—(supposing he would analyze all that was **written** about Jones No. 1 and Jones No. 2), I might have said that it is **A. T. Jones No. 1**, but my reason is given above.]

---

Shortly after this Elder Jones sent out an appointment for three evenings to review the book, and the first night attacked two points, **I was told**. First, where I said we had a man that would meet him, etc. (p. 89), and so questioned the integrity of the author to say they had a man when they did not. Second, as further evidence on this same point he referred to p. 140, where "damnable heresies" are referred to, claiming they were the author's words as the quotation marks were left off by mistake, omitting to read the connection which showed the author had used it as a quotation (see p. 141).

Then the next evening, being present, I called his attention to it and asked him to read it. He read above it, then on the page before, then after it, and all around it, and threw the book down. So I went over and put my finger on the place and told him to read and then he read it in such a listless lifeless way the audience would fail to get it. That night he commenced with a long story;

first referred to the Minneapolis meeting, then said the Lord had made an effort at three consecutive conferences to get the denomination right, citing 1897, College View; 1899 at South Lancaster; 1901 at Battle Creek. Then he said the denomination would start and then go back, but he would not go back with the leaders and so he said here he stood tonight and would stand. Then he waved the book in the air with a look and air of disgust, saying, "Who has changed?" I told him to try his lance on Exhibits **B** and **K**—**Going to pieces**, but he never attempted it nor on any other one of the Exhibits directly, only in this roundabout way.

Elder Jones, you know a man can take the wrong side of a question and do just as you did here at College View when you pretended to review my book. You never even attempted to analyze one of the eleven Exhibits and show up their untruthfulness or mistakes. You know you got into the aeroplane of your own imaginations and flew away around and above us common mortals trying to show how the Lord through Elder Jones had been trying to set the denomination right, especially on these three different occasions, and, as you are at it yet, therefore Jones has not changed. Hence the book is wrong. Now instead of going to the people in this way, show the strength of your position by taking the great cleaver of truth and lay open each and every one of those Exhibits and if you have not time to take all of them take Exhibit B, on Organization, and K, on the Denomination Going to Pieces, and show where we were wrong. Come, get down off your air castle, to these visible things where we can all see you grappling **with the thing itself**, and if you dare not undertake it in public, take it in the stillness of the twilight hour of your own quiet home after eliminating the spirit of this fierce, bloodless battle between us and just before the sacred hour of worship, and then give me the analysis of it. If you care not to do that then take it to the public. You know I have shown a willingness to wrestle with the main pillars of your arguments, also with Rupert's and Ballenger's. However you may think I failed. What I say unto one I say unto all.

## PART TWO

---

I will first call attention to some of the admonitions given to the ministers.

“Angels’ hands will overthrow the deceptions that are being formed. The bulwarks of Satan will never triumph. Victory will attend the Third Angel’s Message. \* \* \* \* Some will go out from among us who will bear the Ark no longer. But these can not make walls to obstruct the truth, for it will go onward and upward to the end.

“In the past God has raised up men and He still has men of opportunity, waiting and prepared to do His bidding, has men who will go through restrictions which are only as walls daubed with untempered mortar. When God puts His Spirit upon them they will work. \* \* \* The truth will not be diminished nor lose its power in their hands. \* \* Satan will misrepresent, misapply and pervert everything he can. \* \* Even in our day there has been and will continue to be entire families who have once rejoiced in the truth who will lose faith because of calumnies and falsehoods brought to them in regard to those whom they have loved and with whom they have had sweet counsel. \* \* \* Many who now claim to believe the truth but who have no anchor will be bound up with Satan’s party. Ministers, do not dishonor your God and grieve the Holy Spirit by casting reflections on the ways and manners of the men He would choose. God knows the character. He sees the temperament of the men that He has chosen.”—Special Test., No. 11, pp. 9, 10, 11.

“The truth must bind us together like strong cords, in order that no distracted efforts may be witnessed among the workers.

“If disorderly manifestations appear we must have clear discernment to distinguish the spurious from the



genuine. Let no messages be proclaimed until they have borne a careful scrutiny in every jot and tittle.

"Every conceivable deception will be brought to bear upon those who have not a daily living connection with God. In our work no side issues must be advanced until there has been a thorough examination of the ideas entertained that it may be ascertained from what source they have originated. Satan's angels are wise to do evil and they will create what some will claim to be advanced light, and will proclaim them as new and wonderful things and yet while in some respects the Message is truth it will be mingled with men's inventions and will teach for doctrine the commandments of men. \* \* \* There may be supposable things that appear as good things and yet they need to be carefully considered with much prayer for they are specious devices of the enemy to lead souls in a path which lies so close to the path of truth that it will be scarcely distinguishable from the path that leads to holiness and heaven, but the eye of faith may discern that it is diverging from the right path though almost imperceptibly. At first it may be thought positively right, but after a while it is seen to be widely diverging."—Special Test., No. 3, p. 62.

### MOSES, A TYPE OF CHRIST.

Christ was a prophet like unto Moses.—Deut. 18:15; P. P., p. 480. Philip said, "We have found him of whom Moses in the law did write," etc. Jno. 1:45. "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren—like unto me. \* \* \* This is he that was in the church in the wilderness." Acts 7:37, 38. "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ is a son over his own house." Heb. 3:5. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." John 1:17. "Who hath \* \* \* brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." 2 Tim. 1:10.

These scriptures indicate at least that Christ was to do a similar work to Moses and that is just what a type or anti-type means.

"How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission." Heb. 9:14-22.

So we see Moses had to do something in his house (though a servant only) both in the dedication of the first testament, also of the first tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, and not only the book that contained the covenant but the people. This evidently shadows forth Christ as a son over His own house; His work in the use of His own blood in dedicating the new covenant and its tabernacle, the heavenly tabernacle; the place of service, an antitype of the earthly tabernacle and its service.

"It is as essential, no more so, and no less, that we have faith in a Redeemer who has come and died our sacrifice, as it was for the ancients to believe in a Redeemer to come, whom they represented by their typical sacrifices." Sufferings of Christ, p. 4.

As the minds of men became more and more blind, so God had to bring out this great gospel truth plainer and plainer. So He made it more tangible that we could see it with our eyes. This He tried to do and did do as much as any material object could represent a spiritual truth. This was done in those sacrifices and offerings and in the tabernacle service, etc. He held up before them this tabernacle which the Lord pitched or organized for the purpose of doing this work to meet the then present conditions. So through that worldly sanctuary the Lord tried to teach His people some things they did not see or comprehend. And when we come to this so-called new covenant we see it was the unfolding of that germ principle from away back from the fall of man, but was not dedicated or ratified till Christ and it is now made known as never before, so the temple was now dedicated and laid open for service as never known. Christ is the anti-type of the passover, the lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world. As a lamb slain from the foundation of the world He is the anti-type of the sin offerings, both of the victim with its blood and the priest who offers the blood and makes the atonement. He offers Himself as the substitute victim without the gate where He suffers. Heb. 13:12. He takes the blood of the victim and dedicates His place of service Himself, like Moses, and all that pertains to it. This new covenant had been in the process of development from the fall. The same might be true of the tabernacle not made with hands, but now at that time they are dedicated and laid open as never before made known, "the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known, unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." Eph. 3:5. Why? "To make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God." Verse 9. So God put it in a material, tangible form clothing it in types, and then laid all open in the anti-type, revealing it so clearly that we all can see at least the great essential and important points, yet we may not understand all the little

minutiae or details that enter into this wonderful system.

The great question between Elder Ballenger and ourselves is, Did Christ enter the holy of holies of this tabernacle, sanctuary or temple to do the work typified by the high priest (set forth by Leviticus 16) on the day of His ascension? He affirms. We deny. While we agree perhaps on many things in this great system of revealed truth we differ radically on the question above and no doubt we will agree that every argument must reach the question stated to have any bearing in this discussion. We will not allow any indefinite or inferential testimony to overthrow a plain definite and explicit declaration of the divine Word.

So we see that it is not enough to show that He went into the second apartment on that day for He might go there for a very different purpose. This he might show in different ways. Our old preachers in the old Third Angel's Message taught that it was not safe to build some special doctrine or system on an inferential testimony and that we must have at least one or two plain, clear, definite and explicit declarations of scripture as a foundation on which to rest the superstructure. Then we could fill in with inferences and human reasons, knowing we had a sure foundation. We would not allow an inference to overthrow a plain "thus saith the Lord." This is self-evident from the fact that if we did allow it we would allow the less to overthrow the greater and so establish all kinds of absurdities. For instance, we called the following, Sunday-keeping arguments: "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." Acts 20:7. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." 1 Cor. 16:2; it could easily be said: "These scriptures point toward the first day of the week as set apart as the day of church assemblies or Sabbath-keeping observance," but they don't say it.

Now I want you to observe closely whether this new movement—this late edition of the Third Angel's Message observes these principles as stated above.

The principles laid down in the beginning of this present article are too plain to be repudiated by any Adventist believer. Even orthodox ministers would not dare to set them aside. Let us look at them a little. We will let Paul express himself freely and see what we can learn from him. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:16. Now remember, that which is "written," for that is the meaning of the word "scripture." So we are assured that the man of God is thoroughly furnished with written evidence to substantiate all the doctrines that are profitable. Then be sure if we cannot get the written statement that it is so we can decide that it is not necessary, or profitable. So we see it needs more than an inference—at least **one** "thus saith the Lord."

Again, Paul says "I kept back nothing that was profitable." Acts 20:20. "I shunned not to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Verse 27. With these points clearly stated by Paul we will expect every profitable doctrine to have a solid foundation: not sand, but a rock; not simply the reasons and philosophy of a man who is likely to be mistaken.

Some have queried why I touched Elder Ballenger's positions so lightly. Well, in fact I did not feel it was necessary to say much about them. But now, as some demand it, I will examine some of his main points at least and we will allow him, Ballenger, to decide what they are. We will turn to his dialogue, where in his book ("Forty Fatal Errors," pp. 2, 3) he exercises great freedom in representing himself as one party and the other as "one who had honesty of heart and courage of conviction to raise the following questions." P. 2, par. 2. He presumes the questions to be what follows covering five pages of his book. So you see he assumes to be that "honest one" who represents us, to ask these questions. That is, he is our attorney in this case. Second, he is the witness that answers these questions. Third, he is the judge and the jury who decides the case. It is

a wonderful verdict. Think of it! He has no occasion to appeal to a higher court for he is satisfied as he has won the case.

Then we have another of like character on pages 26, 27. Does his cause depend upon such profound philosophy as this? I shall as I have in the past allow him to decide; and so use what he says with unlimited freedom.

Now we see by one of these questions (p. 3, par. 2) that he declares "But you (we) are adopting the two principle positions that he (Ballenger) advocated and based on this scripture (Heb. 6:19-20)." The parentheses are mine in the above. Now what are these two referred to? They are: "First, that this scripture refers to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and second, that it teaches Christ went there at His ascension to do His special work," the anti-type of the high priest's work on the typical day of atonement as set forth in Leviticus 16.

So he regarded these his two strongest testimonies or witnesses to sustain his contention. He said to me in keeping with the above that Heb. 6:19, 20, also Heb. 8:1, 2 were his strong points, and added that the "throne" spoken of was in the most holy place, etc. At that time it had slipped my mind what I had known and learned about the location of the "throne," fifty years ago, but it all came to me by reflection. Then I saw clearly how Elder B. makes an impression on some people who have come into the truth during the last twenty, thirty, or forty years, as Christ has been in the holy of holies, before the throne or on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty all my life lacking just three years to a day, as my anniversary comes on October 22.

Paul says "Now in the things we are saying the chief point is **this**, we have such an high Priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heaven, a Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." The chief point is **this**, we have **such** a high priest as **that**; that ministers in the sanctuary in the heavens and "has

somewhat to offer." Heb. 8:3. What to offer? Heb. 9:14. "Offered Himself without spot to God." Heb. 7:27. This He did once when He "offered up Himself." Also 8:25. Nor yet that He should offer Himself often. V. 26. For then must he have often suffered or died often. (Rom. 5:6. "In due time Christ died for the **ungodly**." V. 8. "Christ died for us." V. 10. "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son. Much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." V. 9. "Much more they being now justified by His **blood**, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." Through what He can and will do for us where He now ministers before the Father as a mediator. Heb. 7:25. "Seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them" (us). As a "priest upon His (Father's) throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Zech. 6:13. "For I delivered unto you **first** of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins." 1 Cor. 15:3. The **death** of Christ is the **chief pillar** on which the gospel rests. Ballenger admits the all-atoning sacrifice was made on Calvary. P. 80, "Cast Out."

Now note what he says on p. 2—last question, that "How Bro. Ballenger [speaking of himself] for one solid hour stood before us [S D. A.'s] \* \* \* \* and read scripture after scripture to prove that 'within the veil,' Heb. 6:19,20, pointed to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary." You see in keeping with this statement he takes fifteen pages of his book, "Cast Out" to prove (?) that this scripture referred to above means the second veil and so opens into the holy of holies. Now think of it. This is his strong witness, his Gibraltar.

To illustrate: I have a very important case in court and so to start out good and strong and turn the jury to my way of thinking I put up my best witness first. But what kind of a witness is he that I must put up twenty-five more to show what he means? viz: that it means the most holy place. Why do this? Because it does not say so. See his own words, "Forty Fatal Errors," p. 2, where he says of himself that "Ballenger

stood for one solid hour \* \* \* and read scripture to prove that 'within the veil' Heb. 6:19, 20 **pointed** to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary." You see he can only claim it **points** to it. The finger board points to the city but it is not the city, the thing itself. Nor is the thing itself a pointer to the thing. So you see he must admit that this is not a plain definite declaration of the divine Word that it is the second apartment. Get the scripture that says so. Then you will know you have got a rock foundation without any human reasoning. He repeats over and over again that "within the veil," as spoken by Paul, "Must apply to the second apartment." Then says "unquestionably" the Lord refers to the second apartment. p. 32. Then further says: "'Within the veil' is used in Heb. 6:19 without qualification it being taken for granted \* \* \* that the reader will know without explanation to which apartment it refers." p. 34. His books from start to finish do not produce one definite statement that Christ went into the second apartment, the holy of holies, to do His **regular atonement** work which was the anti-typical work of the high priest. This is the question, the real question. He might go in and out a dozen times for any other purpose, but it would have nothing to do with this question between us, as Ballenger claims He went into the second apartment when He ascended on high to do His anti-typical work there as He had done His work in the first apartment before this, and this text, Heb. 6: 19, 20, he brings forward as his main witness to prove it but it doesn't say so. We believe He went to the first apartment to do His work as He had not yet performed it. Now we will look at a sample of his statements about these twenty-five witnesses he took to prove what his strong witness meant. Heb. 6: 19-20.

"The reader is asked to note carefully that the name which the scripture gives to the first curtain is all through the Old Testament—the door of the tabernacle."—"Cast Out," p. 21.

Then again: "Note how the first curtain is called in verse 36 (Ex. 26), the door of the tent, in contrast to the



veil." p. 2. But I am compelled to say softly that it is not true. Read that verse. Our version calls it the hanging for the door. Revised version calls it a screen for the door. Septuagint, a veil, and in no place is this curtain called a door. Look in all these twenty-five witnesses. Not one of them calls this curtain in contrast with the other curtain, a door. The door is one thing and the curtain is a very different thing. Your window is one thing and the curtain or hanging is quite another. While the Septuagint calls this curtain a veil and Christ and the New Testament writers were in the habit of quoting from this version instead of the Hebrew, Eld. B. repeats these texts, fifteen of which he speaks (p. 24, "Cast Out") in not one of them is the word veil put in contrast with hanging curtain or veil at the door, but with the door itself. He seems to overlook this fact, at least part of the time, in his statements, but this fact is so often repeated that he cannot help but repeat it right part of the time. Yet we see a determination to have the door and curtain the same. See here he quotes Ex. 38:27-30, on p. 23, and says, "The first curtain is called the door, here as elsewhere in contrast to the veil." He admits the Septuagint translation calls this first curtain the veil (not the door but the veil at the door) then says that "the first curtain was a veil both as to construction and use and has never been denied." (p. 27).

See his own words on page 22: "The curtain at the door of the tabernacle is called the hanging." That is right in our version. In the revised version, the screen at the door; Septuagint, the veil at the door.

Let us see what else is at the door. "The altar of burnt offerings which is at the door of the tabernacle." Lev. 4:6. But the altar is not the door, neither is the curtain the door. This curtain is represented by one word in English (hanging or screen) Hebrew, and Greek, while the door is represented by a very different word in these languages. Yet he repeats and contends that the "first curtain" is "designated as the door of the tabernacle." (p. 25). This is under his seventeenth number, and so he goes through with all his twenty-

five texts, which as I have said is a confession that his main witness does not say what he wants him to say, and hence after all this tedious roundabout way of reasoning the strongest word he dare use is that the scriptures point or refer to the second apartment. This shows it is only an inference that may be inferred from the words in the text, Heb. 6:19-20.

Then his proposition is not half proven for that does not reach the question between us which is, Did Christ enter the second apartment to do His work, typified by the high priest, on the tenth day of the seventh month going into the second apartment to make the atonement for the people and cleanse the sanctuary? We say, No, He did not. Ballenger says, Yes, He did.

Ballenger may discuss a dozen side issues and be right in them all and still be wrong on this one. First, he does not know even after all this effort that this text in Heb. 6:19-20 means the second apartment. I don't know it. But I do know these texts in the Old Testament referred to by him do mean the second apartment for the connected thoughts show it, just the same way I know the text in Heb. 9:3 refers to the second apartment.

It would take a text like this last one to justify a man like me to go off on a tangent and get up a new theory or even to believe it without a doubt. Now Ballenger thinks he has proved it by proving that within the veil means the holy of holies and if this so-called proof should convince me that he is right on this side issue, am I such a weakling in logic as to allow that alone to change my mind on this **great** question, the main question between us? For He (Christ) might have gone in there and out a dozen times and yet not have gone there to do His last atoning work. I have believed He went in there and dedicated it all as Moses did the old one, in fulfilment of Dan. 9:24; but I have never thought that this text referred to that event, but supposed it referred to His regular work which was in the first apartment, and hence the veil referred to the entrance of the sanctuary as Paul would seem to indicate

in Heb. 9:2, 3, 12, and 10:19, 20, but I would not have found an argument upon it. It is two indefinite.

I believe this text in Heb. 6:19, 20 harmonizes with the rest of Paul's sermon or letter. Even uninspired men try to keep in harmony at least in one sermon all the way through, while they might seem to contradict on a different subject. A general drift or tenor or harmonious ring from first to last runs through this epistle. Let us see what it is.

We will go a little further on in this sermon. Ch. 10:19, 20. Here his thought is more fully developed and we will see what he says. We will read the revised version as that is considered the best. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to **enter** into the holy place by the blood of Jesus." How? "By the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh." Having a great high priest over the house of God, we see, is a new and living way which He has dedicated evidently into the new and living temple just dedicated and laid open with the new covenant relationship just ratified by this same blood with the great high priest fully installed. This should now inspire us with boldness to grasp by faith the work and the service of the Mediator in the house of God, as our "high priest over this house of God," (Heb. 19:21) is made surety of a better covenant, (Heb. 7:22) "seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them," (us). Heb. 7:25.

Now again: "For Christ entered not into the holy place made with hands like in the pattern of the true but into heaven, itself, now to appear before the face of God for us." (Heb. 9:24). The contrast is made here between the pattern and the true; earthly and heavenly. "Nor yet through the blood of goats and calves but through His own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption." Heb. 9:12. For this cause He is the Mediator of a new covenant. Shall I anchor down on this word "holy place" as proof of my position that He entered there to do His work there, going to the very best translators who trans-

late this word "holy place" (Revised American Standard, Dean Alford, King James, etc.,) holding the accent justified these translations as some editions indicate, as by accent we discriminate between words alike in form but different in meaning—but this belongs to the nicety of grammarians. Then argue that they had reasons for so translating as the ordinary scholars don't understand, knowing the origin, history, and the use of the word. But the facts lead me to take a broader view—that this indicates rather that He had entered this newly dedicated sanctuary in this new relationship and as the Mediator of this new covenant, to commence His priestly work with the blood of this new covenant (Heb. 13:20), which dedicated and ratified the completion of the great plan of human redemption as never before; "so as to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world was hid in God." Eph. 3:9.

The only reason that you, Elder Ballenger, have or can give for saying that the scripture here in Heb. 6:18-20 means only the most holy place, is that the work in the first apartment was done and hence He did not enter to do the work of the holy place but entered so as to pass through to the entrance of the most holy. We all know without a doubt that there was only one entrance to the sanctuary and that was into the holy place or first apartment.

The question, and the only question between us is, Did Christ enter to do His work? If it was simply to enter with the purpose for entering then the fact of His entering the second apartment would prove that He had entered the first. Now we will go to Heb. 9:12. He "entered in once for all into the holy place." Now if that means just exactly what it says, then the question is settled, but if it means more than what it says, as Ballenger and some of the other translators tells us, it must mean at least all it does say, which is that He entered the holy place. But now we will allow the criticism, viz.: that it should be "holy places," then it means both apartments. But now if it is the fact that he said "entered

within the veil," and that means the second apartment, then the fact that he says entered both of these two places, which was the first and second apartment, would prove His work was not done in either apartment but that He had entered to do His work in both apartments.

This scripture is a definite, positive, explicit statement of the divine Word. Hence we are safe to take it as a foundation for a theory on which we can rest, and the only reason that I proceeded to analyze or reason upon it was because of the criticism of our version of the text, also the Revised Standard, Dean Alford, and others; and all that we had need to say was that the criticism says these versions are all right as far as they went, hence the criticism does not change the fact stated one iota.

Now the next text—it has the words "veil" and "holiest" in our version (Heb. 10:19, 20) the very terms that Ballenger was contending for in Heb. 6:19, 20, and why did he not make this his **strong witness**, his foundation, his Gibraltar? Mark you, it says, "**enter into the Holiest** through the **veil**," because he knows that that word "holiest" does not mean the holy of the holies as in Heb. 9:3. "After the second veil which is called the holy of holies," (comes from two words) Revised American Standard and Revised and Dean Alford versions so translate it.

Wilson's Interlinear Greek and others in Heb. 10:19 say "Holy place;" Revised, American, Dean Alford, and Wilson, and some others "holies" or "holy places" but never "the holy of holies." And remember these translators also translate the word in Heb. 9:8 the same as they do in this verse. In both these texts the word, just the same word, is translated "holy place," "holy places" and "holies," while these words in 9:3 are translated "holy of holies" by all these translators here referred to. Look again at this text, Heb. 10:19, 20.

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which He dedicated for us, a new and living way through the veil that is to say His flesh." This version, Revised

Standard and Dean Alford, agree as before in this by saying we enter into the holy place through the veil and these others who say this word should be translated "holy places" or "holies," as it is plural in form, but no one of any standing translates it "the holy of holies."

Mark, this entrance takes you through a veil. Where do you land? One set of translators say you land in the holy place, the others say it lands you in both departments. Hence this entrance is the entrance of both departments. There is only one veil spoken of and only one entrance and this veil hangs at that entrance. If it was the entrance to the holy of holies and the veil is the second veil which closes that entrance, then to go through this veil would land you in the holy of holies and it never would nor never could land you in the first apartment. You would be compelled to come back to get into the first apartment.

Hence you see it is the veil at the first entrance as it is the only entrance to both apartments. But Eld B's. word of preference used in his books, viz: sanctuary instead of holy place or holy places; then to enter the sanctuary you would be compelled to go through the entrance and it only had the one way to get in and that was at the east side where the only entrance to the sanctuary was located and that is where the veil spoken of in Heb. 10:19 is found and hence not the second veil, for it was in the sanctuary used as a covering veil to shut off the view of some things behind the veil. The other, to close the entrance. Did this new and living way lead up to the second apartment and leave the first one out?

I admit, Elder, that Heb. 6:19, 20, is indefinite and "unqualified" as you say. So I would not even dare to rest an argument upon it alone, but would be compelled to go to some other scripture for a foundation or proof of what that one means. And it is a weak thing for you to ride off on a tangent. I think it means the same as Heb. 10:19, 20, and so thinking that way only I can see how others might think differently, but would not and do not absolutely **know** that it does mean the same as Heb. 10:19, 20. But, I do know by the text itself that

Heb. 10:19, 20, means the sanctuary including the two departments and hence the veil is the entrance veil.

I now call up the text in Heb. 9:8. First, let me say that Paul speaks very carefully from the eighth chapter on through the doctrinal part of his spistle. He seems to sum up and itemize in a very particular way all the important things except that in verse five. See how careful he is to speak all that was in the holy place and the holy of holies (9:2, 3) and tell all the particulars; summing up in a few verses a great deal, clear on down at least to v. 22 in ch. 10, where he exhorts and commences to admonish us in these words, "Let us draw near," etc. V. 22.

He especially in chapters eight, nine and ten down to the twenty-second verse, is contrasting the earthly tabernacle, priesthood, offerings, service, and all with the heavenly and this is put in a very concise and emphatic and explicit way. And so I anchor down on this text believing that that is no exception to this rule as stated above. So I unhesitatingly take my position that this is a contrast set forth (Heb. 9:8) between the earthly and heavenly kept all through these chapters.

First, let me say Eld. B. pretends to quote six authorities of whom Dean Alford leads, in saying the "outer or foremost" instead of the "first tabernacle." But Dean Alford doesn't say so. I wish he (Eld B.) had named the others. ("Forty Fatal Errors," p. 42). Then he proceeds to correct the best translators in the world on the word "into" for it is not in the Greek text but may it not be understood—plenty of such things in English. Yes, in all languages.

Now I will give you the reading of a number of translators that I have access to:

First, our version which you all have, which uses the word "**into** the," also "**first**." See Heb. 9:8. "The Holy Ghost this signifying that the way **into** the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the **first tabernacle** was yet standing: which is a figure."

**Revised V.:** "The Holy Ghost this signifying that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made mani-

fest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing which is a parable."

**Dean Alford:** "The Holy Spirit this signifying that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is as yet standing: the which tabernacle is a parable."

**Sawyer:** "The Holy Spirit showing this, that the way into the sanctuary is not made manifest, while the first tabernacle yet has a standing which is a type."

**Murdock:** "The way to the holy [place] was not yet manifested. So long as the first tabernacle was standing and it was a symbol."

**Rotherham:** "The Holy Spirit making this evident that not yet hath been made manifest the way of the holy [place] while yet the first tent hath a standing: which indeed is a parable."

**Wilson Interlinear:** "The Holy Spirit showing this that the way into the holies has not yet been brought to view while the first tabernacle has a standing: which was a figure."

**American Standard:** "The Holy Spirit this signifying that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is yet standing: which is a figure."

**American Revised:** "The Holy Spirit this signifying that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is as yet standing: which is a figure."

**Young's Bible:** "The Holy Spirit this evidencing that not yet hath been manifest, the way of the holy places while the first tabernacle having yet a standing: which is a symbol."

You look and see nine out of this ten translates Heb. 9:3 "Holy of holies" while in the eighth verse seven of the ten say "holy place." Campbell and McNight say "holy places"; Wilson says "holies"; Sawyer translates it "sanctuary."

Campbell and McNight's translation reads: "The Holy Spirit signifying this that the way of the holy places was not yet laid open while the first tabernacle was yet



standing: which was a figurative representation," etc.

The Elder in this case does as he did in discussing the curtain, confessing that it is the hanging for the door (instead of the door) at the entrance. ("Cast Out," p. 22). So he confesses in the very words of Campbell in this text: "When His blood is shed at Calvary and the veil of the temple is rent in twain and the way into the holiest is **laid open** and Christ now in possession of His own blood enters within the veil." ("Cast Out," p. 42.) So he admits it was laid open at that time; so it was not open before and was not laid open while this earthly tabernacle was standing—not till the veil was rent and the services stopped. This confesses all we claim, but we want better evidence than his confession, so we will go right on.

Wilson says: "Not yet brought to view." Rotherham: "Has not been made manifest yet." Murdock: "Was not yet manifested so long as the first tabernacle was standing." So the Elder argues, not with the name, viz: "first tabernacle," but so long as the services were going on in the earthly tabernacle which closed when the veil was rent and the other opened, I suppose dedicated as that is and was in Bible times the common way of opening services,—we call it dedication. The same will apply to all the rest as the word "manifest" and "manifested" is used. Nine out of ten say "first tabernacle." They all say "while the first was standing" or "as yet is standing." Six out of the ten say, "the **way into**." Three say, "the **way of**." One says, "the **way to**."

"Tabernacle" means "a dwelling place," so I would not think the Elder would emphasize first tabernacle so strong for fear he might prove that God dwelt there as well as in the second apartment. Now I will show that this scripture Heb. 9:8, is a comparison of the earthly sanctuary with the heavenly, instituted by way of contrast, while the Elder says: "We are **bound** to conclude that this scripture is not presenting a contrast between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary, but a contrast between the first apartment and the second apartment."—"Forty Fatal Errors," p. 43 (and this is one of

them; see p. 2, No. 10, at the top of the page.) He also says the first tabernacle does not refer to the earthly sanctuary. (P. 41, at the bottom.)

Now the issue is squarely stated between us and if he is wrong his whole contention, his whole cause is lost. Now read all these ten translations. First, "tabernacle." Nine agree in this wording. One says "tent," which is the same as the tabernacle was a tent. Next clause, viz: "which was a figure." "which was a simile," "which was a parable," "which is a type," so all agree here.

A type of what? It first tells what was offered in this tabernacle, both gifts and sacrifices. v. 9. "Which stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances," V. 10. How long? "Imposed on them until the time of reformation." "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands." v. 11. More perfect than what tabernacle? The one which he had just spoken of in the words just dropped from his lips. Answer: "The first tabernacle," which was made with hands. The comparison is made between the one made with hands and the one not made with hands and also "the first tabernacle" and "the more perfect tabernacle." So the first tabernacle does refer to the earthly, the Elder to the contrary notwithstanding. (p. 41).

But again he says in this scripture the contrast (Heb. 9:8) is presented between the first and second apartments. Now look at it from this standpoint. Then this first apartment is a type. A type of what? A type of that with which it is compared by way of contrast, but the Elder says the contrast is between these two apartments so that compels him to say that the first apartment is a type of the second apartment and that compels him also to admit what he does not dare to say, that the second apartment was the more perfect tabernacle; the one not made with hands, but the one in which there was no blood of bulls, goats, and calves offered but only Christ's blood. This proves him wrong again a second time. Now this word "holiest" in our version which he says is the holy

of holies or the second apartment is never translated "the holy of holies" by any one of these ten referred to and he knows the words "holy of holies" come from two words like verse three where all these translators translate it "the holy of holies," while in this text only one of these words is used and is rendered by them "holy place," "holy places," and "holies," and "sanctuary." (Heb. 9:12). Referring to the same thing it is rendered in the same way by these versions as here in the eighth verse, while here the contrast is so sharp that we cannot fail to see its application.

"The more perfect tabernacle," here in the eleventh verse being the anti-type with which this is compared by contrast is the real thing that casts the shadow which is called the first tabernacle. The heavenly things of which this tabernacle is only a shadow are set forth in Heb. 8:5. Hence this more perfect tabernacle with two apartments shadows forth a tabernacle with two apartments, therefore this first tabernacle spoken of in Heb. 9:8 has two apartments which is the shadow or type as Paul here affirms.

Ballenger says that he "endorses the statement \* \* \* that the words 'holy place,' 'holy places,' 'holiest' and 'sanctuary' come from the same Greek word and could be translated 'sanctuary' in every instance."—"Forty Fatal Errors," p. 6, and so he inserts it often. In using Elder B's. preferred term "sanctuary" we have this statement: "the way into the sanctuary was not yet made manifest [Ballenger says "laid open"] while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." What does the "sanctuary" mean here? Does it mean two departments? Read Heb. 8:2. "A minister of the sanctuary and the true tabernacle." Just the same. No question but what the true tabernacle had the two apartments and that is what we have shown is the anti-type of the first tabernacle.

Now notice, the way into this sanctuary was not made manifest or laid open while as yet the first tabernacle was yet standing. He tries hard to eliminate the word "into" and so correct six authorities out of ten,

for he admits that from his standpoint "that the text [must not] could not say that the way into the sanctuary was not yet open when it had **just said** that the priest went always into the first apartment of the sanctuary."—"Forty Fatal Errors," p. 42. But it does say so and the other four versions do not contradict it. Three of the four say "**way of**," the other says the "**way to**" was not open. But he knows the way to or into the second apartment was open while the first apartment was standing, using his phraseology, so he has to throw out six of the ten versions and correct the others by inserting "through," (see p. 42) in his quotation of Rotherham. Hence his theory, his viewpoint is wrong and so he is compelled to twist and turn to get away from this plain and clear view of this text.

This "**way**" that was not laid open while this first tabernacle was standing whose services were "imposed till the time of reformation" (Heb. 9:10) was that new and living "**way**" which Christ had consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say His flesh (Heb. 10:26) and through this it is laid open clearly, emphatically, without a doubt.

One more point showing the absurdity of his statement that this earthly tabernacle was not the first. Let us apply his logic to the first covenant. "For if the first covenant had been faultless then should no place have been sought for the second." We might say it was not the first as the Abrahamic covenant existed before. Why not deny this plain statement because the Abrahamic covenant reached clear back to the fall, but in some sense it was made new by the shed blood of Christ and so He was brought from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant. See also Heb. 9:15. The death of Christ avails for the transgression under the first covenant. The words "while the first apartment has a standing," he explains to mean while the priests were going in and out in the first apartment, the once-a-year going into the second apartment is delayed "is not yet made manifest." (P. 44.) The way into the holy of holies was not laid open, not made manifest, "that is delayed." The Divine Spirit

took a very hard way of saying delayed. "While the first tabernacle was yet standing." That means while the priests were going in and out. Does it? What a stock of information this is! What a revelation for Paul to tell us the way was not open from the first apartment into the second while the priests were going in and out in the first. Not saying a word about the new and living way which this great high priest had consecrated for us through the blood of the everlasting covenant, but instead told us just how and when we could go from the holy to the holy of holies. Do you believe it?

Before I leave this important text I want to illustrate my thought as near as I can do. Take all the connected statements which helps us all to understand.

First. It is a fact to which we all must agree that Paul in this epistle is setting forth in contrast the earthly and heavenly tabernacles, carrying that contrast all the way through the services, their offerings, and the ministers that perform the service, make the offerings, etc. On this ground of common agreement we illustrate: We have had a church. We call it a tabernacle. It has two apartments and only has one door, and that opens in the first apartment which is used all the year but the last day of the year we have a yearly meeting and so we are compelled to use this second apartment and so we raise the veil and go in. The first apartment is sometimes called the first tabernacle (Heb. 9:6) and the second the same (v. 7). It is also called the holy place and the second the holy of holies (vs. 2-3), the two taken together are called holy places, Heb. 9:24). (I am using Paul as he is particularizing on this subject.) Now we build, buy, or fall heir to a new church, and this new one has two apartments, in fact just like the other one, only very fine, perfect in all its parts, ministry, service, and all located at the head of a very fine avenue, all decorated and smoothly paved in the thickly settled portion of the wealthy part of this city, while the first one is located on low and marshy ground in a backwoods sort of place, no paved streets, no decorations along the way, services all dead and formal because they were shadowy and not

real as compared with this other tabernacle or tent and so I am trying to tell a friend of mine about our place of worship. He is one who knows nothing about this new one. So now I will stop right here and insert the words of Bro. Ballenger's preferred translation, viz: Rotherham; not exactly as he quotes it but as it is, and see what kind of an idea my friend would or could get from all this: "The Holy Spirit making this evident that not yet hath been made manifest the way of the tabernacle [church] while yet the first tent [church] has a standing." Would my friend think I was talking about the second apartment of the old church, how to get into it and when, when he knew all about that? Then use the words "into" and it is plainer yet. Transpose the sentence and it will appear plainer. "The way of the holies has not yet been made manifest, while yet the first tent has a standing: which is a parable." This translator translates Heb. 9, v. 3, "holy of holies"; v. 12, "holies"; v. 24, "holies," where we know it refers to both places; then in this eighth verse, the same as verses 12 and 24; then how would my friend understand this word "holies" here to mean "of course both holy places," as in v. 24? I told my friend that in this old church that we called it a tabernacle or tent, but both of these apartments taken together we call the holy places, or holies.

Now then I make this translation my words for further information and so I will do like Paul, refer to what the Spirit has said, not what I say but what the Spirit says. Then read those words as my words taken from the Spirit. The words "first tent"—if I stopped right there my friend might think they referred to the first apartment of the old church or tent as we called it but could he think that that word translated, "holies" here meant the holy of holies when he knew that the second was called the holy of holies when placed in contrast to the first apartment.

He would see clearly I was talking about the first or old church or tent including both apartments which was a type of that new church with two apartments which was not opened for our special service while this old one

was used by us. But when we abandoned the old, or the first church or tent the "way of this," or "way to this" or "the way into this" was made manifest, "make clear, plain, visible, free from obscurity or doubt evident to the senses." (International Dictionary.) A different way. This way opened, paved, beautified and dedicated and leading right up to this newly opened tabernacle. Could he think I was contrasting the two apartments of this old church and that I was trying to tell him that there was no way to get into the second apartment while this first apartment was standing? He would say, "standing, what does that mean?" But Eld. B. says it means while they were going in and out.

As a sensible, logical man, would he not say "how could he abandon or change the great aim and object of his whole epistle" the same as Paul in Hebrews, viz., Showing by contrast the difference between the old shadowy, typical tabernacle and all that old system with the new and living service and jump clear off to contrasting the first apartment with the second of that which was clear and plain to everybody and practiced for over 1,500 years. What would my friend think of me when he knew all about the old church and the **way**, the how and the when to get into the second apartment and I talk this way? The meaning of this text is the text itself and the reason I have spent so much time on it is to take the twist out of it that my brother has given it to show without a doubt that he has no foundation but his distorted imagination on which to stand.

He tells us that a note in a certain reference Bible varicrum uses the word first in verses 2, 6, 8, foremost, outer. Why did he not tell you all this note said, viz., that this word "holiest" in verse eight says "it is the true holy place in heaven," which completely overthrows and annihilates his whole theory.

Then in the face of this display of hardihood he proceeds to appeal to Dean Alford as authority for so rendering it when Dean Alford translates this text, "the first tabernacle," like the rest. Bro. Ballenger did not mean to misrepresent. But his dominant will and his

overbalancing zeal so blinded his eyes that he could not see anything that opposed his theory as he is "bound to conclude that this scripture [Heb. 9:8] is not presenting a contrast between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary."—"Forty Fatal Errors," p. 43. The man who has freed his vision from all these temporary obstacles which would shut out very important views and take into his lungs the God-given air of perfect freedom in the investigation of any and all truth will secure to himself a high viewpoint where everything that has any bearing will be in plain sight and will allow every such thing its full weight in making up his conclusion. This principle I have tried to follow so I dare to emphasize it and be tried by it. I was frank enough to admit the clause, viz: "the first tabernacle," might mean the first apartment, but proved by comparison with the words "holies" or "the holy places" that it did not mean it here in this connection. Why was he not frank enough to admit the note referred to did apply the word holies (verse eight) to the holy places in heaven? I will recite some of these things in his mistakes.

The second strong witness is Heb. 8:1-2. "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." "Who for the joy that was set before him **endured the cross** . . . and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Heb. 12:2. "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10:12. "When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb. 1:3. "When He raised him from the dead, and set him at His own right hand in the heavenly places." Eph. 1:20. There is no question but these scriptures carry the idea clearly that He is set or sat on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty on high. Some things come or take place before this, expressed in these words: "endured the cross;" "after He had offered one sacrifice;" "when He had by Himself purged our sins." No one nor all of these texts put together tell us when to a day it was that He sat down on the throne. Only it was



after certain events. Nor do they tell where the throne is at this time, so we are compelled to go to some other texts for these points.

But Bro. Ballenger's views of this compels him to say that He ascended, made His offering as the anti-type of the high priest on the day of the atonement, then returned to the earth on that same day. "How long do you think it would take Christ to sprinkle His blood on the mercy seat at His ascension? That He performed this work on a single day is evident."—"Forty Fatal Errors," p. 65.

"When Christ has made the atonement at the mercy seat He is told to sit down on the right hand of the Father and wait for the finishing of the work."—Id. top of p. 67.

You will see the Elder is very critical and wants us to analyze every fiber of the atonement question and so we will in return ask him to harmonize his view. We will speak later about the atonement. Well, he is sure that which happened was in the second apartment, for he says: "Nowhere in the scriptures are we taught that the throne of God dwelt in the first apartment." Hence his conclusion that Christ entered the holy of holies on the day of His ascension, made His offering, then set down there on the throne to wait, etc. But he had already said He "made this atonement and later on the same day appeared to His disciples."—pp. 65, 66. Now tell us if your position is tenable. If Christ must be in the second apartment to be on the throne at His Father's right hand and could not be on the throne at the right hand of the Father, if He was in the first apartment how could He be on the throne at God's right hand those forty days that He was here on earth; and could He carry on His mediatorial work away from the mercy seat and law? Well, if He could do it here on earth why could He not do it in the first apartment?

Now if the throne is a living thing, no part of it inert matter, but every part of it doing its part of this service with the Father, then we will not be puzzled about its location for where the Son is the Father is not very

far off, neither the throne, the mercy-seat, the covering cherubs nor the law. If it is all a living, an organized body as Ezekiel, chapter ten, and Isaiah represent it, and if Christ is all and in all, the great center of this compact or pledge made with the Father, then I should say His assistants are not far away from Him in His mediatorial work, whether before Him or behind His back; on this earth or between earth and heaven. But to my mind this is more susceptible of proof and more reasonable, Elder Ballenger, than a whole lot of this that you have turned out from your philosophy as suggested by your questions.

Ballenger says the throne is living and movable. See "Cast Out," p. 12. If it is movable then God made it so and for the purpose of moving it when necessary and hence we would not be surprised to find it moved from place to place. My neighbor has an automobile and he has a place for it, too, but it is movable and it was made that way, and could not serve its purpose if it was not movable. Why challenge me to show that it was ever seen in or ever moved to Lincoln? Why, it is the most natural thing in the world to see it in Lincoln. It would not be quite so apt to be moved to San Francisco, but it might be, because it is a very movable machine. Yet it is not a living machine. Tell me why it was made that way? Elder B. says in "Forty Fatal Errors," p. 63, referring to Ezekiel, "That this throne visited the earth and returned to heaven." How did it get here? Did it not come out at the door of the tabernacle? Well, it came out through the holy place. Then if it returned to the most holy place it passed through the holy place. Again, Bro. B. does not tell us how long it was on the earth, but we see it was in the holy place twice on that one visit. Now, Bro. Ballenger, answer your own profound unanswerable question, ("Cast Out," p. 13): "No one denies that God's throne is living and movable, but the question is, Did God move His throne into the first apartment? And if so did He move the mercy-seat and the law or did He leave the mercy-seat and the law behind and minister the gospel from a throne separated from His law and mercy-

seat?" "During the last four years I have laid this difficulty before the leading men of the denomination and not one has ventured an explanation." "No one has dared to say that when the throne was moved out into the first apartment that the ark and law went with it . . . and no one has dared to affirm that the law and mercy-seat was deserted." Now that is a long question and what is there in it? I will tell you one thing I see in it. It reveals the full character of the brother's contention and his mode of reasoning. Now suppose that I could not answer and the whole denomination for four long years of study of all the translations and after ransacking all the libraries have failed to find an answer. Now what is the conclusion? Therefore it was not moved into the first apartment. What are the premises? The major is that it is movable. The minor is that it came to this earth once and went back. You see his reasoning. Now I say if that is not his conclusion then there is no point in it and he has gained nothing.

Now, wait, I am about to get an answer that he dare not gainsay or deny. Now, Bro. B., you tell us how God got along in His work in ministering the gospel from a throne separated from His law and mercy-seat when on that visit to the earth or did He take the ark and mercy-seat and the tables of stone and law all with Him? This was not a vacation. Did not His work go on just the same? If not, why did He bring the throne along, if it was not to continue His work of ministering the gospel, and if so did He leave the most holy place vacant without any furniture?

Did my neighbor leave his place for his auto vacant when he went to the city? Profound question!

If it was a living, moving throne, which it was, and so was made for the purpose of moving, as it was a living thing, perhaps just an organized body of angels who could move and did move just the same as Michael, the archangel, or Gabriel, or even God Himself, why not demand of us to show that Gabriel ever moved into the first apartment and also to show where God's throne was when He came down to the door of the tabernacle in a

cloudy pillar and talked to Moses, (Ex. 33:9.) Told him "no man could see His face and live" (v. 20), "but he would put him in a cleft of a rock while he passed by" and so he could see his back parts (v. 23).

Now we can see there is nothing in all these so-called unanswerable questions concerning the throne unless he takes the position that God as well as His throne is unalterably fixed to the second apartment, and that is too ridiculous for him notwithstanding the large stock of this kind of matter that he seems to have on hand. Just think of it! The God of the Universe and the throne from which He operates confined to one little spot of heaven. I am glad He has given us a broader idea and said that "heaven is His throne and that the place of our sanctuary is a glorious high throne." (Jer. 17:12).

But the Elder is not going to believe unless we show him it was moved in there, into the first apartment. "Did God move His throne into the first apartment? This is the question?"—"Cast Out," p. 13, second par. First, I say yes, and Ballenger dare not deny it. "Could it not just have returned to its dwelling place in the holy of holies following its mission to some other place as in the case of Ezekiel's vision where it is represented as visiting the earth and then returning to heaven?"—"Forty Fatal Errors," p. 63. See Eze. 1 and 10). **I said yes**, God moved it there on this mission as He brought it to the earth and He took it back there when He went back to heaven, if your position on Ezekiel is true and it moved there every time it went off on a mission (and you here admit it leaves the second apartment and goes off on missions as it came to the earth on a mission.) Now if it would or could go off to the old fallen world on a mission why question the idea of its going into the first apartment on a mission? But while this answers your question I am willing to commit myself further.

So we go to the New Testament, Revelation 4, also the fifth chapter. First, a door is opened in heaven so we see something. We could not see till this door was opened. We have already found that a new and living way laid open into the sanctuary through the veil which

was hung at the entrance or door, so it opens out to our view some things that were in there at that time. "And there were seen seven lamps of fire," and we all know that the seven lamps so-called (Exodus: "Light the lamps") make a candlestick of pure gold, (Ex. 25:31) with six branches, (v. 33.) See Ex. 26:35, also 40:22-24. The table of show bread "put into the tent of the congregation without the veil on the north side," (v. 22.) The candlestick put on the south side (v. 24.)

So we see they were looking into the first apartment. What else? Behold a throne was set in heaven. Rev. 4:2. Indicating that it had just been set or moved. Just as it is stated in Ezekiel 10:4, 18, 19, and the glory of the Lord stood over the threshold, (v. 4); stood over the cherubim, (v. 18) stood at the door (v. 19) just moved there. The very first thing that came in sight was the throne. A symbol of God's glory, of His divine presence which had appeared so often at the very door of the tabernacle and these four and twenty Elders fell down before the throne (v. 10) hence they were in the same apartment where these seven lamps were burning before the throne; the Elders were there; in fact the whole scene was there in this first apartment and the lamb was in the midst of the Elders (5:6) and these four living creatures were round about and in the midst of the throne, so you see the throne itself is living creatures and these other ones were in their midst.

Now see how clearly the type foreshadowed all this, the great and important things of the type; the leading, the main drift, the tenor—not every little minutiae that could be picked up in the type,—is typical. Now we have a plain statement without any human reasoning that God promised to meet Moses there at the door and also the children of Israel. "This shall be a continual burnt offering. . . . At the door of the tabernacle of the congregation **before the Lord**: where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee." (Ex. 29:42). "And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory. And I will

sanctify the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar." (vs. 42, 43). This is the first apartment and so it means here. The revised version says in all these places, "tent of meeting." The man that went there went before the Lord (see v. 42) because the Lord had promised to meet him there, not only the priests but all Israel. He was to meet the high priest at the mercy-seat. (Ex. 25:22). He proposed to do as He had been doing with him, also the people. He met Moses at the door of the tent of meeting as he called it (Ex. 33:7-9) "and a cloudy pillar descended and stood at the door, a symbol of God's presence, and the Lord speaks unto Moses. The Lord spake unto Moses out of the tent of meeting or tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. 1:1) the same as you see in the sixteenth chapter where the tabernacle of the congregation is distinguished from the holy place. Repeats it five times (vs. 16, 17, 20, 23, 33.)

Now go to Eze. 10: 4, 18, 19, and there was "the appearance of a likeness of a throne, (v. 1) "and the glory of the Lord went up from the cherub and stood over the threshold of the house and the house was filled with a cloud and the court was filled with the brightness of the Lord's glory." (v. 4). Same thought is in v. 18. And they "stood at the door of the east gate of the Lord's house and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above." (v. 19). This cloud in which He always appears shuts off the brightness of His glory. "I will appear in the cloud on the mercy-seat." (Lev. 16:2). "Behold the glory of the Lord appeared in a cloud." (Ex. 16:10). "The Lord descended in a cloud." (Ex. 34:5). "The Lord said, lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud." (Ex. 19:9). This shows in type the everyday place of meeting was at the door of the first apartment, and a cloud indicates His presence and hence we would expect something to answer to it, and John in Revelation four, gives it to us in the shape of a throne with a rainbow round about it and the shining glory of the king upon it. Now I will ask you to read in "Early Writings," to see how closely it fits these scriptures, not simply as proof, for I have proved my point, Ballenger of course to the con-

trary notwithstanding. Read "Early Writings," pp. 34, 46. "This door [unto the most holy place] was not opened until the mediation of Jesus was finished in the holy place of the sanctuary in 1844. Thus Jesus arose and opened the door into the most holy place and passed within the second veil." (p. 34). "I saw the Father rise from the throne. . . . and go into the holy of holies. Then Jesus stepped into a chariot and was borne to the holy of holies where the Father sat." (p. 46).

I see no trouble whatever with Dan. 9:24. Ballenger believes the real atonement or the atonement in reality was made on the cross. I believe there was an atonement on the cross (but it was not the anti-type of Lev. 16) and this is the question between us. The atonement more clearly refers to the work of the priest as in Lev. 16. We are reconciled by His death, (Rom. 5:10) death of the Son, and all our late translators change that word in v. 11 to "reconcile." I don't think they would all agree if there was not some decided reason for it and hence they must have seen a shade of difference in the words "reconcile" and "atonement." If not why change it? But I do not believe the idea of the atonement as set forth in Lev. 16, was made on the cross for I believe the leading Bible idea of it is found in this typical atonement set forth here. It is a mistake to conclude that what we sometimes call synonyms always mean exactly the same thing. Take "stone:" "make expiation for," "make amends for;" "render satisfaction for," and the first definition of expiate is "to atone by suffering," and you might atone and not suffer at all, simply give an equivalent, make amends, but in a secondary sense it means to agree at-one-ment and so you might agree without suffering. The first definition given to reconcile is "to restore to friendship." The fact is when we get to discussing words there is no end to it and so we will allow our translators versed in the little niceties of the languages to settle it.

Now the Elder is doing with this question just like he did with the veil question—labored hard and long to show that it was never called a veil but it was called the

door while all those scriptures read called it the hanging at the door but admitted it was a veil in every particular. So now here he labors hard to show that it was the offering made at the mercy-seat that made the atonement; and so that atonement was made then when God accepted this offering which made that atonement. He came back to this earth that same day making that day the day of the atonement. So that would prove us wrong you see, yes, and all of those texts referring to it. But now he says: "In reality it was made on the cross." (p. 100). Then further says it was not the offering of His blood [death] that made the atonement for sin but it was His **death** that made atonement. Then why all this other effort? There is some truth in this confession that Christ's death is called an atonement but there is no truth in it that this so-called atonement is the anti-typical atonement of Lev. 16, made by the high priest in the second apartment on the tenth day of the seventh month. It looks like the whole aim and object is to get away with this great day of atonement and so prove us wrong. But you see he has a hard time of it.

As I have repeated several times, Christ is the great anti-type of all these types. "Moses saw that the sacrifice of Christ was prefigured by all the types and symbols of the Jewish age." (Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 330). That includes all: paschal lamb, first fruits (Cor. 15:20); Moses, a mediator of the old covenant; dedication and all. Look at the paschal lamb and Christ is our passover. (Cor. 5:7). The lamb was slain on the fourteenth day of the first month and it was the preparation of the passover. ((Jno. 14:34). Christ ate the passover and the next day, either the fourteenth or fifteenth, was put to death, and arose from the dead early Sunday morning, which was the sixteenth or seventeenth. The morrow after the Sabbath was the day for the offering of first fruits to be offered, then the scriptures tell us just fifty days from this last event came the Pentecost. Now all these types were fulfilled with scrupulous exactness to a day. Lev. 23:11, 16.

Now as to the next symbolical event. Could Christ



on the day of His ascension, viz: the seventeenth of Abib, (or the first month), enter on his antitypical work of an atonement which was always confined to the tenth day of the seventh month? But Bro. Ballenger's theory ignores this type. Right in the face of this fact and several others of like character he cries out again and again "This does violence to the type," and nearly all of them are nothing but his **conclusions** from what we say, but in reality not what we **say** at all.

If I was going to divide the atonement into two divisions I would surely make one on the cross without the gate where the victim was slain, and show that that was the atonement referred to that was full and complete.

The type of this offering, sacrifice, reconciliation, is here called an atonement. (Lev. 1:4). It says "**if any man,**" (v. 2). That is any and every individual. Then we see again, "if any one of the common people sin," (Lev. 4:27), the sinner was to lay his hands on the head of the victim (v. 29), then the priest took the blood of this sin offering and put it on the horns of the altar of the burnt offering and so made the atonement, (vs. 30, 31). The trespass offering was the same, so we have a type of Christ's offering and atonement on the cross without the gate in the court, before He ascended but this was not the anti-type of the day of the atonement which Christ had finished and God had accepted. This would be a very natural division both in location and time if we should divide it.

Bro. B. admits now the atonement in reality was made on the cross and then says it was not the offering of His blood that made the atonement but His **death**. (p. 102). I say amen. But he applies this to Lev. 16 as the type, which is not true, for that is done by the priest with blood in the sanctuary after the death of the victim while this other was outside of the sanctuary. Now we hold him to his statement above. Then in reality the offering was made on Calvary at the cross. Hence the offering which He made was before He sat down on the throne at the right hand of God. This would be where I would divide it.

But he arbitrarily divides it into two divisions without anything in the scripture to justify it. Why not divide it into five more divisions, it would be just as reasonable? viz., "And He shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary; second, He shall make an atonement for the tent of meeting; third, and the altar; fourth, He shall make an atonement for the priests; fifth, and all the people of the congregation." (R. V., v. 33.) Now when He shall make an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tent of meeting, and the altar (v. 20)—What? Now stop and waits, sits down for 1800 years having all the sins upon Him. No!

The death of Christ is the great thing in the gospel: it is the pillar, the great sacrifice, the offering. It was this that moved the great heart of the Father and touched the inmost soul of the loyal host. So His death furnished all the elements for this great day of atonement, typified in a general way, just as near as an earthly, material thing could set forth a spiritual or heavenly thing.

The reconciliation brought about by the death of Christ comes inside of the seventy weeks of which Daniel speaks (Dan. 9:24) and harmonizes with the following quotation from the spirit of prophecy, vol. 3, pp. 202, 203. which is given farther on.

Let us look at these texts which speak of this **offering**. Take this into the account—that this typical is not a perfect image. (Heb. 10:1). I mean that there were some little things that could not enter into the anti-type for instance, Christ had no need to make an offering for Himself. He was the anti-type of the victim but not of the priest who laid his hands upon the victim, then slew the victim, and so we might call attention to a number of such things, but this is enough for a suggestion, and further, we are accustomed when we use a figure to represent some other thing to carry the very words of the figure into the other thing as, "the lamb of the pass-over," and as that represents Christ so we call Him "a lamb," also the "first fruits." This could not be applied literally—so we might go on indefinitely.

I will just refer to these texts, but you turn to them.

Heb. 9.6. "The priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God." So it is called God's service. The high priest went into the second apartment and offered blood for himself and the errors of the people. How? See. First washed himself; then put on his priestly robes; then made an offering for himself; then took two goats and brought them to the door of the tabernacle; then cast lots; then killed the goat and caught the blood; then immediately, before the blood got cold and coagulated (as that would defile the tent—could not wait three days, no, not three hours) took this blood and took coals of fire off the altar and burnt incense and so went in before the mercy-seat; then sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat seven times with his finger and before the mercy-seat; then comes out into the first apartment and sprinkles the blood with his finger seven times upon the altar. When he had finished all this he came out of the tabernacle, laid both hands on the head of the live goat, confessed over him all the iniquities, transgressions and sins, putting them on the head of the goat. Lev. 19:33.

How much is typical of these many things named? Will Ballenger tell me? No question but this **service** is typical of Christ's **service**—His last service in heaven above just before He lays off His priestly robe and comes to the earth to execute the judgment there passed.

Will you say we will commence at the point where the blood was caught? Will you say He took the blood in a basin warm from the victim and literally sprinkled it on the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat just seven times with His finger? Does He stop at this point and let the blood get cold and wait 1800 years? Did He complete the sprinkling of the blood at this point?? This whole transaction represents His service as an advocate, as a mediator, pleading His blood, representing His death from the very time He commences His service till the close of probation? There is no stop in the type, or wait, till the sins are removed to the head of the goat. Remember the very words used to describe Christ's service or work are taken from the description given in the

words used in the type which is a common thing even today. Types like prophecy always look forward not backward to make plain the future. If it is about Babylon it may be named in its fulfillment. All the great chains of prophecy commence near the standpoint of the prophet and on; so with the typical system, hence it does not go back to the fall of man to make us see and understand our duty.

Now I will show the real offering, the real sacrifice and suffering which was on the cross of Calvary. The act of the Son of God to plead His blood was a very natural act and every moment laden with joy both to Christ and all the heavenly host.

But death! O how different. Angels weep and come to strengthen Christ for the conflict. All nature shuddered at the sight and its great heart throbbed in agony to see its Author dying on that cruel cross. The brightest light of the heavens veiled itself in darkness, refusing to behold the sight. Heaven and earth was wrapped in gloom and painful silence reigned supreme at that hour. O come, my soul, renew your vows, renew your pledge to be true and faithful to one that has borne so much for you. O why have you been so unfaithful and so derelict in duty? It is the cross, crucifixion and death from the beginning to the end of the gospel plan of human redemption. "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ." (Gal. 6:14). "Having made peace through the blood of the cross." (Col. 1:20). "For I determined not to know anything among you but Jesus Christ and Him crucified." (Cor. 2:2). "We preach Christ crucified unto the Jews." (v. 23). "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." (Rom. 5:10). "Ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (Cor. 11:26). "That I may know the fellowship of His sufferings being made conformable unto His death." "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death." (Heb. 2:9). That by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament." (Heb. 9:15). "Both [Jews and Gentiles] reconciled to God by the cross."

"We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son."

First read Heb. 9:12. This we have spoken of and don't forget that the blood represents death. Abel's blood cryeth from the ground. Again Jesus took the cup and gave thanks . . . and said this is my blood. You do not believe in transubstantiation, hence you say it represented His blood. Matt. 26:28. Then said "as oft . . . as ye drink this cup ye do show forth my death." (Cor. 11:26). What does this blood show? His death. Let Ballenger speak: "When the blood was shed the life was taken. Hence the blood represents the death of the victim. Therefore it is **death** that maketh the atonement."—Forty Fatal Errors; p. 100. Again: "So Christ went in once and offered once it was not the **offering** of His blood, (death) that made the atonement for sin, but His **death** that made the atonement." (Id; p. 101). But was that offering in this text, blood? What does that represent? **Death**. What then is the real thing even in this text? **Death**. Now we will show by some other text in this connection that is just what it means.

"Who need not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once when he offered up—" What? Blood? No,—"himself." (Heb. 7:27). "Who through the eternal Spirit offered **Himself** without spot to God." (Heb. 9:14). What load was He carrying when He offered Himself? See: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. 9:28). Where? "Who His Own Self bore our since in His own body on the tree." (1 Pet. 2:24). How are we sanctified? Through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. These scriptures show that it was on the tree (cross) where He bore our sins and where this offering was made once for all while the twelfth verse shows His work in the sanctuary after this offering on the tree by the blood which represented this **death** or offering.

One more text which Ballenger uses: "Nor yet that He should offer Himself often as the priest enters into the holy place every year with blood. For then must he often have suffered." Hence the offering he is talking

about has suffering in it while the offering of the blood or doing this service in the sanctuary had no suffering in it. It was all on the tree.

I repeat again. He says, "The atonement in reality was made on the cross" and as the atonement could not be made three days before the offering, hence the offering referred to was made on the cross. Now one of these two things must be true: there are either two atonements, one on the cross, more critically called reconciliation, and one by the priest in the second apartment of the sanctuary. Or else the one in the sanctuary is a continuation of the one on the cross and a part of the same thing, but either way would not change the place where the offering was made. Now see how these facts are corroborated by the "Testimonies."

This evidently refers to His death which was for all the world while that transaction in the holy of holies was only for those who afflicted their souls and availed themselves of the benefits of the cross. You see when the "hammer" of the divine Word (Jer. 23:29) is used by the right hand of power (not thumb and finger—that is all right to take the wild hairs or motes out of the eye) it will break the great boulders of error into atoms and grind them to powder and they will become like the chaff of the summer's threshing floor. And the wind will carry them away, so no place shall be found for them. "These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke, with all authority." (Titus 2:15). "This witness is true. Therefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." (1:13). "Rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine." (2 Tim. 4:2.) "For there are many unruly and vain talkers . . . whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses teaching things which they ought not." (Titus 1:10-11).

## CONCLUSION

The question, Did Christ enter the second apartment when He ascended to do His work as the anti-type of the high priest on **the day** of atonement, as set forth by Lev. 16, Ballenger affirmed, we denied.

**First:** We have shown that the testimony of his

main witness, Heb. 6:19-20, is neither definite nor positive as to which place this veil opened into. And this he conceded by saying, "if the witness (Heb. 6:19-20) had said first veil that would have settled it." Neither did he say second veil). Then he introduced a number of witnesses to show Paul meant something he did not say.

**Second:** We have shown by the language of the text itself (Heb. 10:19-20) in this same letter by going through the veil here spoken of you pass through the only entrance the sanctuary has and that lands you in the first apartment, which makes this statement definite and so it is not only possible but very probable that Heb. 6:19-20 means the same as this text. By way of corroboration I quote the following from "Great Controversy," pp. 420, 421: "The ministration of the priest throughout the year in the first apartment of the sanctuary **within the veil** which formed the door and separated the holy place from the outer court." . . . "Thither the faith of Christ's disciples followed Him as He ascended from their sight. Here (in the first apartment) their hopes centered, 'which hope we have,' said Paul, 'as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever.'" Here it is applied to the first apartment.

**Third.** I have shown that the way into the sanctuary, above, "was made manifest," "brought to view," "laid open," at least in a way that it was never laid open before (Heb. 9:8) at Christ's ascension and Bro. B. unconsciously or unknowingly confesses the same by using the very words of Campbell's translation "laid open." (See "Cast Out," p. 42).

**Fourth:** I have shown that the throne is a living, moving institution (evidently composed of angels) and is no more confined to one place than God Himself, and the Elder admits this and also that it came to this earth on a mission of which we have a record (Eze. 10) and how many times it went out on a mission we are not told. 'It was organized for that purpose) and so it had to pass through the first apartment if it was in the second, to

get out. Then we have shown that it was seen in the first apartment, (Rev. 4), corroborated by the following: "I saw the Father rise from the throne and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies \* \* \* \* Then Jesus rose up from the throne \* \* \* \* then a cloudy chariot with wheels like a flaming fire came where Jesus was. He stepped into the chariot and was borne to the holiest where His Father sat." ("Early Writings," p. 46).

**Fifth:** I have shown that there was an atonement made on the cross for all the world but more generally called reconciliation, as we are reconciled by His death. (Rom: 5:11). But this was not the typical atonement made with blood in the second apartment of the sanctuary by the priest after (not before) the sins had been committed and only for those who availed themselves of the benefits of Christ through this reconciliation, brought about by His death.

Corroborated by these Testimonies:

"Through the shed blood, he (Abel) looked to the future sacrifice, Christ dying on the cross of Calvary; and trusting in the ATONEMENT that was THERE TO BE MADE. He had the witness that He was righteous and His offering accepted."—"Patriarchs and Prophets," chap. 5, par 6, p. 72.

"He (Christ) ascended to the heavenly courts and from God Himself heard the announcement that His ATONEMENT for the sins of men HAD BEEN AMPLE."—"Desire of Ages," chap. 82, par. 9.

"Jesus refused to receive the homage of His people until He knew that His sacrifice had been accepted by the Father, and until He had received the assurance from God Himself that His atonement for the sins of His people had been full and ample, that through His blood they might gain eternal life. Jesus immediately ascended to heaven and presented Himself before the throne of God, showing the marks of shame and cruelty upon His brow, His hands and feet. But He refused to receive the coronet of glory and the royal robe, and He also refused the adoration of the angels, as He had refused the homage



of Mary, until the Father signified that His offering was accepted. \* \* \* All power in heaven and on earth is now given to the Prince of Life yet He does not for a moment forget His poor disciples in a sinful world, but prepares to return to them; that He may impart to them His power and glory. Thus did the Redeemer of mankind, by the sacrifice of Himself, connect earth with heaven, and finite man with the infinite God."—"Spirit of Prophecy," vol. 3, pp. 202, 203.

"All that heavenly host was eager to celebrate His triumph, and glorify their King. But He waves them back. Not yet; He cannot now receive the coronet of glory and the royal robe. He enters into the presence of His Father. He points to His wounded head, the pierced side, the marred feet; He lifts His hands bearing the prints of the nails. He points to the tokens of His triumph; He presents to God the wave sheaf, those raised with Him as representatives of that great multitude who shall come forth from the grave at His second coming. He approaches the Father, with whom there is joy over one sinner that repents; who rejoiceth over one with singing. Before the foundations of the earth were laid, the Father and the Son had united in a covenant to redeem man if He should be overcome by Satan. They had clasped their hands in a solemn pledge that Christ should become the surety for the human race. This pledge Christ has fulfilled. When upon the cross He cried out, 'It is finished,' He addressed the Father. The compact had been fully carried out. Now, He declares, 'Father, it is finished. I have done thy will, O my God. I have completed the work of redemption. If thy justice is satisfied, 'I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am.'"

"The voice of God is heard proclaiming that justice is satisfied. Satan is vanquished. Christ's toiling, struggling ones on earth are 'accepted in the beloved.' Before the heavenly angels and the representatives of unfallen worlds, they are declared justified. Where He is there His church shall be, 'Mercy and truth have met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.' The

Father's arm encircled His Son, and the word is given 'Let all the angels of God worship him.'—"Desire of Ages," trade edition, pp. 1001, 1002. Subscription edition, p. 834.

**Sixth:** We have shown that the typical atonement which was made by the high priest in the sanctuary through the efficiency of the blood represents Christ's service or last work in the sanctuary, the second apartment thereof, done through the efficacy of His blood which represents His death and so blots out or removes sin, to its very last stain. This is called the cleansing of the sanctuary, and is verified by the following:

"And in the wisdom of God these particulars were given us of this work that we might by looking back to them understand the work of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary \* \* \* \*

"As the priest entered the most holy place once a year to cleanse the earthly sanctuary, so Jesus entered the most holy place of the heavenly at the end of the 2300 days to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by His mediation and thus to cleanse the sanctuary."—"Early Writings," p. 116.

"The work of Christ for our redemption was symbolized by the sanctuary services."—"Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 149.

**Seventh:** We have shown that the great sacrifice the offering (which had suffering in it) "which was made once for all" [the world] was in the court where the sin offering was made, at the door of the tabernacle, on the altar that stood outside in the court and here an atonement was made. (Lev. 4:34.) All the offerings of all kinds had to be made here under the penalty of death. (Lev. 17:4.) And Christ was the anti-type especially of the sin and trespass offerings and in this "He made it once for all"—an atonement.

These points are all corroborated by the following quotations (to call special attention to which I will emphasize certain words and clauses) and ask you also to re-read the former quotations:

"The Lord, through Moses, gave the most definite

and explicit instruction concerning every point of this typical service. The ministration of the sanctuary consisted of two divisions, a daily and a yearly service. The daily service was performed at the altar of burnt offering in the court of the tabernacle, and in the holy place; while the yearly service was in the most holy."—"Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 352.

"The sacrificial lamb represents 'the lamb of God,' in whom is our only hope of salvation. Says the apostle, 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.' It was not enough that the paschal lamb be slain; its blood must be sprinkled upon the door-posts; so the merits of Christ's blood must be applied to the soul. We must believe, not only that He died for the world, but that He died for us individually. We must appropriate to ourselves the virtue of the atoning sacrifice."—Id., p. 277.

"Moses was a type of Christ. He himself had declared to Israel, 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto Me; unto him ye shall hearken.'"—Id., p. 480.

"He saw that the sacrifice of Christ was prefigured by all the types and symbols of the Jewish age; and it was the heavenly light streaming from Calvary, no less than the glory of the law of God, that shed such radiance upon the face of Moses."—Id., p. 330.

"The **most important part** of the daily ministration was the service performed in behalf of **individuals**. The repenent sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle, and placing his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice. By his own hand the animal was then slain, and the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil. \* \* \* \* By this ceremony the sin was through the blood transferred in figure, to the sanctuary."—Id., p. 354.

"Its two holy places were 'patterns of things in the heavens;' Christ, our great high priest, is 'a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.' As in vision the apostle, John,

was granted a view of the temple of God in heaven, he beheld there 'seven lamps of fire burning before the throne.' He saw an angel 'having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne.' Here the prophet was permitted to behold the first apartment of the sanctuary in heaven; and he saw there the 'seven lamps of fire and the golden altar' represented by the golden candlestick and the altar of incense on the sanctuary on earth."—Id., p. 356.

"The incense, ascending with the prayers of Israel, represents the merits and intercession of Christ, His perfect righteousness, which through faith is imputed to His people, and which can alone make the worship of sinful beings acceptable to God. Before the veil of the most holy place, was an altar of perpetual intercession before the holy, **an altar of continual atonement**. By blood and by incense, God was to be approached,—symbols pointing to the great Mediator, through whom sinners may approach Jehovah, and through whom alone mercy and salvation can be granted to the repentant, believing soul."

"As the priests morning and evening entered the holy place at the time of incense, the daily sacrifice was ready, to be offered upon the altar in the court without. This was a time of intense interest to the worshipers who assembled at the tabernacle. Before entering into the presence of God through the ministration of the priest, they were to engage in earnest searching of heart and confession of sin. They united in silent prayer, with their faces toward the holy place. Thus their petitions ascended with the cloud of incense, while faith laid hold upon the merits of the promised Saviour prefigured by the atoning sacrifice."—Id., p. 353.

**Eighth:** I have shown that the priest sprinkling the blood on the altar of burnt offerings and also the altar of incense is a type of Christ's service and work all through these years in the first apartment.

**Ninth:** That the high priest on **the day** of sprinkling the blood on the mercy-seat seven times with his finger

and on the tabernacle and altar was typical of Christ's work on the antitypical day of atonement as set forth in Lev. 16.

This is verified by the following quotations:

"God commanded that an atonement be made for each of the sacred apartments, as for the altar, to 'cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.'

"Once a year, on the great day of atonement, the priest entered the most holy place for the cleansing of the sanctuary. The work there performed, completed the yearly round of ministration.

"On the day of atonement, two kids of the goats were brought to the door of the tabernacle, and lots were cast upon them, 'one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat.' The goat upon which the first lot fell was to be slain as a sin-offering for the people. And the priest was to bring his blood within the veil, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat. 'And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness.'

"And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited.' Not until the goat had been thus sent away, did the people regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins. Every man was to afflict his soul while the work of atonement was going forward. All business was laid aside, and the whole congregation of Israel spent the day in solemn humiliation before God, with prayer, fasting, and deep searching of heart."—Id., p. 355.

**Tenth:** I have shown that the work of the priests both in the first and second apartments of the typical

sanctuary shadows forth the reality which is carried out by our great high priest in pleading His blood, the representative of His death and suffering before His Father in both these departments; which harmonizes with all types forshadowing the future but not the past and also harmonizes with these quotations.

"Important truths concerning the atonement were taught the people by this yearly service. In the sin-offerings presented during the year, a substitute had been accepted in the sinner's stead; but the blood of the victim had not made full atonement for the sin. It had only provided a means by which the sin was transferred to the sanctuary. By the offering of the blood, the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed the guilt of his transgression, and expressed his faith in Him who was to take away the sin of the world; but he was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law.

"After His ascension, our Savior was to begin His work as our high Priest. Says Paul, 'Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for us.' As Christ's ministration was to consist of two distinctive divisions, each occupying a period of time and having a distinctive place in the heavenly sanctuary, so the typical ministration consisted of two divisions, the daily and the yearly service, and to each a department of the tabernacle was devoted.

"As Christ at His ascension appeared in the presence of God to plead His blood in behalf of penitent believers, so the priest in the daily ministration sprinkled the blood of the sacrifice in the holy place in the sinner's behalf.

"The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel the sin; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the **final atonement**; so in the type the blood of the sin-offering removed the sin from the penitent, but it rested in the sanctuary until the **day of atonement**."

"Then by virtue of the atoning blood of Christ, the sins of all the **truly penitent** will be **blotted** from the books of heaven. Thus the sanctuary will be freed, or cleansed,

from the record of sin. In the type, this **great work of atonement**, or blotting out of sins, was represented by the **services of the day of atonement**,—the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary, which was accomplished by the removal, by virtue of the blood of the sin-offering, of the sins by which it had been polluted.”

I have stayed within range of the title of this book from the beginning to the end. I have not hesitated to say “thou art the man” because I believed it just and right. I believe the circumstances demand it. I don’t believe in the half covering up and concealing under what some good people would call the mantle of charity when a warfare is declared and waged publicly, openly and definitely against us by withholding the names of the leaders who have laid siege to our fortresses and to our strongholds without any reserve and have gone so far as to ask us to surrender peaceably without resentment and throw open our door for their purposes. Hence, as I believe in definite and explicit statements, so I have used their names definitely and do not consider it ungentlemanly, unmanly, nor unchristian. I have applied no hard names. I have not accused them of open and known wickedness, nor charged them of immortality, but have said that they are heading a rebellion against our cause (the Third Angel’s Message), and so I claim the right to advertise them this way; especially when they are so free and anxious to have the public know that they repudiate the denomination and its leaders for holding fast to the old settled doctrines of their faith and for casting them out as they call it. So much so that they (Jones and Ballenger) gave two sermons each day to show why they were cast out at their camp meeting here to convert sinners. This meeting lasted about a month. Three strong men, one from Battle Creek, Mich., about 700 miles, and one from California, about 2,000 miles, the other from Oklahoma, about 300 miles. How many do you suppose was converted. How many did they bring into the truth, Sabbath, etc? I did not hear of one here in the College View meeting.

There is no subject in all the Bible that demands

more careful thought than this great subject of the atonement, and perhaps there is no subject in the Bible that has been written upon so much and yet is so little understood both by believers and unbelievers and perhaps there is no subject so easily to misunderstand. It has been made the subject of opposition both by professed reasoning and ridicule, generally on the ground that the atonement idea is opposed to sound reasoning. While it is clear to us that strict justice and mercy could not operate together only on the highest ground of reason and these two great principles, justice and mercy, are lodged in every human soul by their Creator and hence must operate together at the judgment bar where we arraign all responsible beings only (for their actions), while living creatures that are not subject to moral government are not called to an account nor is nature in her operations. So justice and mercy unite together, and this is the one only possible way to save man, as justice and mercy were attributes of the infinite God from eternity.

Christ seized upon this and so pledged Himself as a sacrifice for man's redemption. Then the Father turned this great responsibility over to His Son and when man fell He withdrew His presence not allowing any man to see His face and live and Christ became all in all to the human race. He is our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. We also see that He was prefigured by all the types and symbols of the Jewish age. First: "Moses himself was a type in the place he occupied as mediator, deliverer, leader, law giver, judge and organizer. The sacrificial lamb represented Christ and it was not enough that it should be slain, it must be eaten. The first fruits and the offerings, all the individual offerings, burnt, trespass and sin-offerings and also those made on the day of atonement in some way represented Christ. He was the contral figure.

"God's work is the same in all time, although there are different degrees of development to meet the wants of men in the different ages. \* \* \* There has been a gradual unfolding of the purposes of God in the plan of redemption."—"Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 372.



Everything that the Allwise could do to have man see and understand the plan has been done. He brought down this heavenly and spiritual truth and clothed it in earthly and material form, so we could have no excuse for not availing ourselves of its benefits and its everlasting blessings. O let us once more stop and shut ourselves out from the busy bustle of this inconstant life and consider carefully and prayerfully as we never have done before the importance of grasping with a firmer grip these unmerited favors.

---

I find the following mistakes after an examination of Eld. Ballenger's arguments, statements and declarations on his two principal points: First, the Scriptures (Heb. 6:19, 20) refer to the holy of holies. \* \* \* Second, Christ went there to do His work there as the anti-type of Lev. 16 when He ascended.

1.—It is a mistake to undertake to establish a theory or a doctrine without a definite statement of the divine Word.

2.—It is a mistake to be compelled to call ten of twelve witnesses to show that your main witness meant something he did not say.

3.—It is a mistake to believe a doctrine thus founded so strongly that you would leave the denominational orbit and fly off on a tangent.

4.—It is a mistake after going off to blame the denomination for casting you off or out when they had simply recognized where you had gone.

5.—It is a mistake to say that the first curtain, all through the Old Testament is named the door of the tabernacle, when it is always called the hanging for the door or the hanging at the door.

6.—It is a great mistake to make such a broad, wholesale statement that the first curtain is always by the said Scriptures called the door.

7.—It is a deceptive mistake to say that the Hebrew Scriptures never calls the first curtain a veil when they always call it a hanging or screen, while Robison in his Greek lexicon gives "veil" as the definition of hanging or screen.

8.—It is a mistake to say that the Levitical law names the first curtain not the veil but the door.

9.—It is a mistake to say that in Leviticus the first curtain

is always designated as the door while the first curtain nor the word that means curtain is not used in Leviticus.

10.—It is an inexcusable mistake, after admitting three times over that the first curtain is a hanging at the door, to try to make it appear that it is the door.

11.—It is a mistake to so confound terms so different in meaning as curtain and door and thus lead astray your readers. See "Cast Out," pp. 21-26.

12.—It is a mistake, after confessing that the first curtain is a veil both in construction and use, to resort to such tactics as above to weaken the unavoidable conclusion. *Id.*, p. 27.

13.—It is a mistake to proceed on the ground that the mistake that the curtain is called the door would cease to be a mistake when repeated fourteen times over.

14.—It is a mistake that inheres and adheres all the way through these last seven that the Elder has never learned that the opening into a building is called a door.

15.—It is a mistake of the malignant form to say "that the Septuagint never calls the first curtain a veil except in the directions for making and moving it," when the fact is that that is the only place where the first curtain is spoken of.

16.—It is a misleading mistake to say "that the Septuagint refers twenty-two times to the first curtain in Leviticus and every time calls it the door when it never once calls it the door. *Id.*, p. 8.

17.—It is the same kind of a mistake to say that the Septuagint never calls the first curtain a veil in Leviticus because the word hanging or the word from which it comes which is translated "veil" is not in Leviticus.

18.—It is a mistake to say that the Holy Spirit gives to the second curtain only the name "veil" and the same Spirit gives the name "door" to the first curtain, when the Holy Spirit, through the Septuagint, has repeatedly given the name veil to the first curtain and also through Paul (Heb. 9:12) by implication.

19.—It is a mistake to say the Atonement in reality was made on the cross as being the antitype of the Atonement of Lev. 16 and it compels you to make the five following mistakes: (See "Forty F. E.," p. 100.)

20.—(a) It is a mistake which virtually says the Antitype of the paschal lamb is the same as the Lord's goat in Lev. 16.

21.—(b) It is a mistake to assume that the day of the crucifixion being either the 14th or 15th of the first month is the day of atonement, which was the 10th day of the seventh month. Lev. 16.

22.—(c) It is a mistake to preach that the Atonement made on the cross without the gate is the same as made in the sanctuary by the priest with the blood after the death of the victim.

23.—(d) It is a mistake to teach that the death of Christ or eviction in the court is the same as the service of the high priest

in the sanctuary on the day of the Atonement.

24.—(e) It is a self-contradictory mistake to say that the Atonement in reality was made on the cross, then argue that it was made on the ascension day by Christ in the most holy place three days after.

25.—It is a mistake to say that the Antitypical Atonement made in the sanctuary by the blood of the victim was made for the whole world while the type shows it was made only for those who confessed their sins.

26.—It is a mistake to confound the Atonement on the cross without the gate (or the death of Christ) made for the whole world with that made in the sanctuary by His blood.

27.—It is a mistake to say that the Atonement made in the sanctuary was made hundreds of years before the sins were committed while in the type it was not made till after.

28.—It is a typical destroying mistake, and like the above it compels you to make five more, to say that the ascension day is the day that Christ made the Atonement. "Forty Fatal Errors," p. 65.

29.—(a) It is a mistake to say on the day of Christ's ascension (which was either the 16th or 17th of the first month) was the day He entered the most holy place to do His work there, when the type did not allow it under severe penalty to be entered upon till the 10th day of the seventh month. *Id.*, p. 65.

30.—(b) It is a mistaken idea that the Atonement symbolized by the high priest on the day of the Atonement in the sprinkling of the blood seven times with his finger on the mercy-seat, etc., could be done in a few minutes, and Christ return to the earth the same day, when it typified Christ's service as our Mediator. *Id.*, p. 65.

31.—(c) It is a mistake to locate the judgment to commence at the ascension of Christ when that Atonement day was a judgment day with Israel; while all the Scriptures put the judgment in the future from Paul's day. Acts. 24:25.

32.—(d) It is a mistake to repeatedly call our attention to the importance of lining up with the types and then disregard a fundamental of the same.

33.—(e) It is a mistake to say that Christ officiated in the first apartment before His blood was shed, being the antitype of the sin offering made by the priest after the death of the victim as the blood is the basis of the service in the first apartment as well as the second.

34.—It is a mistake to argue that there would be an unanswerable difficulty for a living moving throne to move to any part of the sanctuary or even to any part of heaven itself.

35.—It is a mistake to rely on an argument which would be only tenable on the ground that the throne is unalterably fixed to the second apartment.

36.—It is a mistake to conclude that the throne was not moved into the first apartment because your so-called difficult

question remained unanswered for four years. "Cast Out," pp. 12-13.

37.—It is a mistake that shuts off your vision so you can't see the throne in the first apartment with the seven lamps. Rev. 4:1-8.

38.—It is a mistake to say that heaven is God's throne and then contend that it is not feasible to carry on the mediatorial work in any part of heaven much more in the first apartment of the sanctuary. "Cast Out," p. 34.

39.—It is a mistake to say that Christ was shut away from the presence of His Father and also the ark and mercy-seat for 4,000 years by a curtain of angels.

40.—It is a mistake to not tell us how Christ could officiate in the first apartment for these 4,000 years separated from the law, in view of your difficult question.

41.—It is a mistake to carry the idea that to move the throne into the first apartment would involve an unanswerable difficulty when you admit it moved to the earth without any difficulty. "Cast Out," pp. 9, 10, 38, 39.

42.—It is a mistake that God did not manifest His presence at the door of the tabernacle. Forty F. E. pp. 29, 42.

43.—It is a mistake to try to make it appear that the cloud which appeared at the door of the tabernacle was not a symbol of God's presence.

44.—It is a mistake to argue that the tabernacle of the congregation does not have direct reference to the first apartment.

45.—It is a mistake to represent Dean Alford as using the words "Foremost," "Outer," instead of the word "first" in his translation of Heb. 9:8. See "Forty F. E.," p. 42.

46.—It is a mistake to pretend to quote Rotherham on Heb. 9:8, and change the word "way of" to the "way through" the holy place. Id.

47.—It is a mistake to quote Variorum Reference Bible in his foot-note and omit that part which overthrows your whole contention on Heb. 9:8 which says the "holies" referred to is heaven itself. Id.

48.—It is a mistake to quote authority like the revised version which uses the words "way into" the holy place, etc., while a large majority of the translators use the same words, and you, with a very limited knowledge of the Greek, comparatively, say that word should not be used, also saying, "Of course the text could not say that the way into the sanctuary was not yet open." But it does say so. Id., p. 42.

49.—It is a mistake to quote an author that you say and believe is unreliable to prove a point, as you repeatedly quoted Mrs. White. Id., pp. 65, 66, 83, 101, etc.

50.—It is a mistaken idea of this whole subject that brings in all this confusion and gives rise to all these foregoing mistakes and others not mentioned. But this is enough to show the whole thing is a mistake.

Now you will notice the most of these mistakes are founded on the very words of the author of the books referred to and some of which we have given you the page where found, and these are all on just two leading or principal points, and before we close we will call your attention to some inconsistencies not including any of these mistakes.

You see, they (this company) are all very zealous for the name "**Cast Out.**" I see by looking over their little paper of eight pages published monthly that they have ample room to give at least one page on an average in each issue for the last eight months (and many of them much more) to articles or comments on the subject of "Cast Out" or "Another Gospel" (I call it), "which is not another," as Paul says.

I have nothing to say about the appropriateness of the name "**Cast Out**" for it is one of your own choosing. It is no nickname. It is not what your enemies gave you, but you took it yourselves. I don't say you invented it, neither do I say that an unseen hand revealed it to you; but some way, some how, you got hold of it, and I have no disposition to contest the ownership.

But here I will quote a few words from Ballenger in the issue of his paper for September, 1914:

"The next meeting was held at St. Louis among the Cast Out ones" (Cast out for what?) "whose only crime is that they read a little book called 'Cast Out for the Cross of Christ,' and believed in its teachings," etc., which is subversive of the Gospel of Christ.

In closing, I want to say first of all, I determined to follow up the investigation of this subject as fairly, honestly, and intelligently as I knew how.

Second, to know no man but to speak as plainly and clearly as I would in the demonstration of a problem in mathematics, and to place the problem as far beyond any dispute as possible by showing the absurdity of any other solution, notwithstanding that all men feel more or less sensitive when their theory is touched.

Now I might stop and recount our long friendship, our mutual services and our former admiration for each

other, and it is possible that herewith all admiration will cease. But be that as it may, now in the name and honor of a noble manhood, and in the name and common interest of that cause to which you in the past gave your life's service, I entreat you to protest against this one-sided course which must eventually leap back upon yourselves. Must you continue to give proof to the world that you are incapable of defending the cause of which you have boasted in the past and that you are now helpless to uphold the same, and that it is impossible to raise above the ties that bind you to your so-called arguments?

No man believes stronger than I do that every man in religion, especially, ought to do his own thinking as far as possible, and every wise man knows his way of thinking decides the kind of society or company he shall have, and if that company is not conducive to the future good of himself and family, then he is responsible if he does not put a check on that way of thinking, for some way, some how, nine times out of ten there is something wrong. But if a man knows he is right he can afford to stand still and put his trust in God.

Your children just emerging from childish sports and youthful innocence need now as never before nor after, the Christian influence of some good school. Yet you dare not send them to one of ours, believing as you do that we are Babylon. I shudder at the thought when I think of the history of the children of two families that lead off in one of these movements referred to in this book. It is hard enough to make success when everything is favorable.

### INCONSISTENCIES.

1.—It is inconsistent to go 2,000 miles to a camp meeting, and you and your companions in the ministry give two long discourses each on the gospel of "Cast out" expecting to convert sinners.

2.—It is inconsistent in the extreme after having begun "in the Spirit" of the gospel years ago to be so entangled and bewildered by such a gospel as to change leaders and not know it. Did you receive the Spirit by

the preaching of the Gospel of the Third Angel's Message, or by preaching your message of "Cast Out?"

3.—It is inconsistent for a minister to preach another gospel than the gospel of Christ.

4.—It is inconsistent for you to believe and preach that you have a special work to do for us and expect to do it with this kind of a message.

5.—It is inconsistent to call us out of one of the families of Babylon and adopt us in the family of "Cast Out" expecting to better our condition.

6.—It is inconsistent for you to class all the Advent families as Babylon, taking upon yourselves the whole responsibility of warning the world in this generation.

7.—It was inconsistent with this work before you to close your meeting at College View till you leaders put away your differences.

8.—It is inconsistent for one of you to believe that the atonement was made on ascension day, another believe it commenced in 1844, at the end of the 2,300 days, and the other leader believing the 2,300 days does not end till 1995, and also believe that probation will end in 1918.

9.—It is inconsistent for these three radical leaders differing so widely on the three-fold message to federate expecting to carry a harmonious warning to the ends of the earth.

10.—It is inconsistent for these three wandering stars having different orbits and centers, to hope to contribute to one common end and so enlighten the whole world.

Now, brethren, look at a few things square in the face. In view of the fact that you really believe that we are now living in the last of the last days, and also believe that the S. D. A.'s are Babylon, and the work of warning the world must rest upon you as the only ones giving the Third Angel's Message, how can you hope to do it in this very short period of time? You especially, Eld. B., you must change your views on the 2300 days and adopt Rupert's and Jones' theory in part so as to have the 2300 close in 1995, and thus extend the time. However, you would have to persuade Elders R. and J. to eliminate their 1918 closing probation period or else you would be worse off than now for time.

I adjure you to stop and think what is necessarily and absolutely involved in this professed belief and movement of yours. Stop a moment and tell us when and where your message commenced and also when and where we became Babylon.

Now you, the three leading men of this movement, met here in campmeeting at College View. You were here about ten days. The other brethren about three times that long. Now was it not a very ordinary, tame concern? Now you know there was no special manifestation of God's Spirit that indicated that God had placed His stamp upon it. You brethren don't even claim that, do you? Then, I ask again, how can you hope to perform this great work in this time so incredibly short, believing us to be Babylon so we could not help you, but must be a hinderance. But if you had the truth and God saw fit to put His stamp upon you so you could go forth in the bright and shining light of His truth instead of the sparks of your own kindling, then you might hope.

The older men of this message have seen it pass through many a conflict for the last threescore and ten years, but the old ship has never stranded. On, on she moves. The heart of the great engine throbs with courage and hope and blows her breath of defiance against all opposing elements. They seem as chaff before her during all these sweep of years.

How often we have seen a dark and threatening cloud appear and heard the mutterings of a coming storm assuming a destructive form, plowing its way through the distant forests, leveling the objects of man's hope to the very dust; but as she approaches nearer and nearer with all hands ready it seems as but a little driving mist.

Then again that is hardly passed till another appears in the dim distance more formidable than the first, and the bosom of the mighty deep is lashed into foam. The angry billows rise higher and higher and come a little nearer and nearer till the old ship feels its force and it would seem that its raging billows would sweep clear over her sinking masts, one blow of its mighty power to shock, stun and paralyze, like a bullock struck with a butcher's



mallet, that she would need no second stroke. But nay, verily, not a timber creaked, not a wheel stopped, not a throb of the heart of the old engine was missed. It had spent its force, and when the mists had cleared away there was the old ship shining in the clear light as a garment newly washed, sailing smoothly and quietly upon the surface spread out before her like a great mirror, all calm and quiet.

It does not seem to make any difference who is at the helm, she glides along just the same. One man takes hold and works till his strength is exhausted, then another and another, and so she glides on, and will till the end. How often we have thought if this one should die the work would stop, or at least we would not know what to do, but the Lord has always had a man ready to take hold. One after another, one after another of the old hands has died at his post, but the movement goes on. While some of these things are sad to consider, yet the saddest things are those considered in this book.

But we see again and again leading lights have gone out; stars of the first magnitude, in which we were caused to hope, have risen high and became luminous in our sky, have gone down in a cloud behind the horizon in utter darkness. And others have been persuaded that the old ship was going down and madly plunged overboard for safety.

But let me say, this is not to happen so. It is not the result of human ingenuity, great reasoning, nor wise planning, but there is an unseen hand, a hand beyond the limits of our vision, that is guiding the affairs of this movement for His glory and our good.

Now let me say we are buoyant with hope and strong with courage that the old ship will have a successful voyage and will land her cheerful and happy crew in the port of safety.



